Volume XXX] *April, 1925* [*Number 3*

The

American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AT RICHMOND

MANY if not all of those who attended the Richmond meeting of 1908 regarded it as the pleasantest the Association had ever had. The only way to surpass it in this respect was to meet in Richmond again. This the Association did in the closing days of 1924. The result justified so well-reasoned a choice; and that the members knew what they had to expect is plain from the registration, which mounted to the exceptionally high figure of 537, a figure never surpassed in the Association's history except at its twenty-fifth anniversary (New York, 1909).

The attractions of Richmond for a December convention of students of history are not simply those of an active, enterprising, and handsome city situated in a milder climate than most of them are permitted to inhabit. They find there also many a building, and in the environs many a scene, that carries the imagination instantly back to great historic events and memorable historic characters—the old Capitol, the Executive Mansion of the Confederacy, the homes of Marshall and Lee, the banks of the James, the half-circle of famous battle-fields. They find an historical atmosphere, that is to say, remembrance in many minds of a great tradition, of a notable part played in the making and sustenance of the nation, of days both of exaltation and of poignant suffering. In the State Library and Archives, at the Virginia Historical Society, and at the Confederate Museum and Battle Abbey, they see the very stuff of history.

But after all the chief element in the visitors' pleasure came from the genial and hospitable spirit of the men and women of Richmond. In organized form it was shown by the long list of societies whose chosen representatives had co-operated with the Committee of Local Arrangements headed by Mr. J. Scott Parrish, in providing for the entertainment and welfare of the guests. But not less abundant a

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

source of pleasure was the spontaneous and native cordiality and kindness shown daily by all Richmond. Through the effective efforts of Mr. Morgan P. Robinson, secretary of the local committee, to whom the Association is especially indebted for the pleasures that marked its meeting, many societies and institutions threw open their doors. The Commonwealth Club and the Woman's Club extended the privileges of their houses. The Westmoreland Club entertained the gentlemen at a "smoker"; the Virginia members of the Colonial Dames of America provided a reception for the ladies. The governor of the state gave at the Executive Mansion a reception to all members of the Association and of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the Agricultural History Society, and the National Council for the Social Studies, which met at the same time and place. Not to be forgotten is the unique entertainment provided after the exercises of the Saturday evening, in the rendering of old plantation melodies, "spirituals" and the like, by the Sabbath Glee Club, a well-trained organization of colored singers.

The days of the meetings were Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday (December 27, 29, and 30). Thus a Sunday intervened, and whenever this happens it adds greatly to the social pleasure of the occasion, by increasing those opportunities for talk and for furthering of acquaintance which to many members constitute the prime good of such meetings. The pleasure of the Sunday at Richmond was heightened, however, by the thoughtful kindness of the local committee in providing opportunities and conveyance for visiting places of interest in the city, or the battle-fields around it (with admirable commentary by Mr. Douglas S. Freeman, director of the Confederate Museum), or the typical old Virginia mansion of Westover, in its early days the home of the famous Colonel William Byrd, now that of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Crane.

On the day after the ending of the formal sessions there was an excursion to Jamestown and Williamsburg, in which a hundred or so members participated, as guests of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities and of the College of William and Mary. To one who had not seen Jamestown since 1891, before the devoted ladies of the society first named had begun their valiant efforts to restore and preserve, the visit to Jamestown was exceedingly interesting, and well worth a rainy journey over wintry roads. In 1891 Jamestown was in its natural—or unnaturally neglected—state. The river was encroaching at the rate of several feet a year. Much of the old town area was already under water. Nothing visible remained of the earliest and most venerable of English American

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

settlements but the ruined tower of the old brick church and a few gravestones in the church-yard. Soon after that date, however, the United States engineers constructed a revetment along the James which has protected our hallowed *pomoerium* from further losses. The old church has been reconstructed by pious hands, interesting discoveries being made in the process. Excavations have laid bare the foundations of several of the original houses of Jamestown, including the " state houses ", and have revealed the plan of the town, much like that of an English market town.

At Williamsburg the old buildings and the new were alike of interest, the old for their quaintness and their historical associations, the new for their evidence of the prosperous growth of the College of William and Mary, in whose dining-hall the visitors were hospitably entertained at luncheon. From Williamsburg some made also the interesting excursion to Yorktown.

In Richmond the headquarters hotel was the Jefferson, whose arrangements lend themselves admirably to the purposes of such a convention, and in whose ample rooms most of the sessions were held. The two exceptions were the first evening session, held in the large auditorium of the Second Baptist Church, where after addresses of welcome by Governor Trinkle and Mayor Bright, the acting president of the Association, Professor Charles M. Andrews of Yale University, gave the thoughtful address, " These Forty Years ", which we had the pleasure of printing in our January number; and the business meeting of the Association, held in the spacious and handsome gymnasium of the University of Richmond, whose abundant hospitality, in the luncheon just preceding, is held in grateful remembrance, and whose attractive new site and new buildings were a source of additional pleasure.

Is it thought that too great space is given in this brief chronicle to these amenities? But they are the means of sociability, and though the social contacts of members with other members or with local society lie beyond the power of record, no one doubts that they furnish not only the chief pleasure of these meetings, but also one of the chief elements in their profitableness and their influence. The power and value of the American Historical Association lie mainly in the fact that its members—those at least who attend its meetings—know each other, and are accustomed in the closing days of each year to converse and discuss with each other in hotel corridors and lounges. It is these habits, and the resulting unity and consensus, which have given to our national societies of specialists the influence and power which they have acquired in these last forty years. Those who can not remember the days when a professor of history

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or mathematics in any given college knew almost none of those who professed history or mathematics elsewhere can have hardly any conception of the broadening of individual outlook which has resulted from these Christmas meetings, or of the influence which these societies have exerted upon the intellectual life of America. One of our literary-political weeklies devoted a sixteen-page supplement to the group of such meetings. That never happened before; and though the comments were mostly written with the amused but tolerant flippancy appropriate to such journals, it was a cheering sign of growing appreciation of the public importance of our learned societies.

The programme, prepared by the careful and experienced hand of Professor St. George L. Sioussat, was an exceptionally good one. It did not escape the defect of congestion. Seventy papers or addresses are too many even if all of them should prove to be excellent, which is not likely. Every year the chairman of a programme committee sets out with a laudable resolve to simplify the programme. What makes it difficult or impossible for him to succeed is, usually, the zeal of the specialist clamoring that his particular division or brand or by-path of history shall be "recognized", preferably by devoting to it a whole session. But is this zeal for the promotion of specialists defensible on intellectual grounds? American historical scholars, especially those devoted to American history, pretty certainly specialize too much, in proportion to the time they spend in wide reading in the broad fields. The student of Jacksonian politics or of the course of cotton culture who can not enjoy a really good paper on the Byzantine court or the fall of Poland is not wholly fit to teach American history.

On the present occasion especially successful efforts were made to invest with general interest the evening sessions, when members, and the public, are gathered with one accord in one place. The first evening was mainly occupied, as has already been mentioned, with Professor Andrews's address. The interest of the other two was greatly heightened by the presence of distinguished representatives of British historical scholarship, and the programme of those two evenings was largely shaped by that presence, the former being devoted to the Anglo-American question, What remains to be done for the Development of the History of the British Empire? the latter to the recent diplomatic history of Europe.

The British guests, twelve in number,[1] had been invited to the occasion in an effort to return, after a manner, the hospitalities of

[1] The following is the list of delegates from the British universities: Oxford, Rev. Dr. Alexander J. Carlyle, chaplain and lecturer of University College (and

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

London in 1921, when the historical teachers of the University of London organized and conducted with much success an Anglo-American Conference of Professors of History, attended by some forty Americans then in England. At the Columbus meeting of the American Historical Association it was voted that a similar conference should be made a feature of the meeting at Richmond. Merged in a general meeting of the Association, such a conference would necessarily have in formal respects a different character from that of 1921, but, now that it can be looked back upon, it seems plainly to have had some of the same good results. The British guests "played the game", and commended themselves everywhere by their amiable acceptance of unfamiliar conditions, their cordial interest in the proceedings, and the high quality of their own contributions. Most of them were able to remain in America long enough to visit, or to lecture at, some of the American universities or colleges, under arrangements made through the effective organization of the Institute of International Education. The profit we had hoped for from their visit was certainly obtained; and on their side, if they carried back some heightened interest in America, its history and its establishments for higher education, it suffices. Their students as well as our own will in that case reap the gain which is always hoped for from these international exchanges—a gain which to the present chronicler, as in the course of editorial study he turns the pages of European journals, seems not unneeded in Europe. If he were a European, and thought the United States to be, as European newspapers say, politically and financially the most formidable power in the present world, and if he were an historical scholar who held it to be one main function of history to explain the development of the chief forces at work in that world, he would, he thinks, make much study of American history.[2] Yet the last number of the *English Historical Review* devotes to American history one page (a review of one pamphlet) and seventeen lines, the last number of the *Historische Zeitschrift* two pages, the last number of the *Revue Historique,* in one place and another, a total of seven lines. It is not

Dr. William L. Grant, Principal of Upper Canada College); Cambridge, Dr. John H. Clapham, fellow and tutor of King's College, James R. M. Butler, fellow of Trinity College, and Major Harold Temperley, fellow of Peterhouse; Edinburgh, Professor Sir Richard Lodge; London, Dr. Hubert Hall, Professor Albert F. Pollard, and Professor Robert W. Seton-Watson; National University of Ireland, Miss Mary T. Hayden, professor in University College, Dublin; Manchester, Professor Frederick M. Powicke; University of Wales, Professor Charles K. Webster; Birmingham, Principal C. Grant Robertson.

[2] For one concrete instance, has a federable empire nothing to learn from the history of the chief of federal republics?

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two days since the writer saw it stated once more that America has no history, apparently on the ground that the United States began its career so recently; yet it would be surprising to hear that the history of Europe ends in 1776, or that all that has happened since is negligible.

Not such was Darwin's estimate. Speaking with that quiet deliberation which gave so much weight to all his utterances on human affairs, he said, "Looking to the distant future, I do not think that [a then recent English writer] takes an exaggerated view when he says, 'All other series of events—as that which resulted in the culture of mind in Greece, and that which resulted in the empire of Rome—only appear to have purpose and value when viewed in connection with, or rather as subsidiary to' . . . the great stream of Anglo-Saxon emigration to the west." After fifty years more of the world's development, it is not provincial boastfulness but plain arithmetic that may lead one, "looking to the distant future", to think somewhat as Darwin thought.

As has been usual, the programme of the Richmond meeting consisted partly of conferences devoted to practical considerations in special lines of historical activity, and from which practical results, within or without the Association, are expected, and partly of sessions devoted to the reading of papers in this or that field of historical learning. It is the former which, from the informality of their procedure, give opportunity for discussion, sometimes genuinely profitable. The sessions devoted to papers, at the rate of four or five papers a session, afford no chance for this, yet have their uses, for information or other modes of edification.

The annual conference of archivists included a paper on British Records of the World War, by Dr. Hubert Hall, of the London School of Economics, who during more than forty years' service in the Public Record Office was the constant friend and helper of every American who went to London for purposes of research in that repository; a full account of archive legislation in the American states during the years 1921–1923, by Mr. George S. Godard, librarian of the Connecticut State Library; and a paper of Notes on the Destruction of Historical Records—destruction both by fire and through negligence—by Mr. Robert B. House, state archivist of North Carolina.

The annual conference of state and local historical societies occupied itself with two topics. The president of the Virginia Historic Highway Association, Mr. Junius P. Fishburn, described that highway, a circuit of roads through Virginia intended to include all

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the chief points of scenic and historic interest. Mr. Laurence V. Coleman, secretary of the American Association of Museums, in a paper on Museums of History, brought to bear upon those institutions, often mere lifeless adjuncts of historical societies, the modern conceptions of museum management: that a museum should be, not a mere collection, but a working organization; that its material should be organized for reference and study, and not all put in display; that its exhibits should expound a principle or illustrate a story; and that its educational work should be kept in intimate and constant relation with that of the schools.

The perennial, but always vital, subject of the position and treatment of history in the schools was considered at a "luncheon conference" of members of the American Historical Association, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the Virginia Society of History Teachers, at which the Outlook for History in the Schools was first discussed in an address by Principal Thomas J. McCormack, of the La Salle-Peru (Illinois) High School. His view was that the subject of history was in danger of being eliminated from the curriculum of the secondary schools. Professor Albert E. McKinley, of the University of Pennsylvania, expressed a more hopeful view of the situation.

At the "luncheon conference of the patriotic societies", Mrs. Alton B. Parker, of New York, described the recent activities of the Daughters of the American Revolution in New York State; Mr. George S. Godard, of Connecticut, those of the various hereditary-patriotic societies in his state; Mrs. Albert Sioussat, of Baltimore, those of the National Society of Colonial Dames of America; and Mrs. Livingston R. Schuyler, of New York, those of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

The chairman of the Association's committee on historical research in colleges, Professor William K. Boyd, of Trinity College (now Duke University), North Carolina, arranged a conference of those interested in that subject—essentially, the subject of historical investigation carried on in teaching institutions which have not the advantages of large libraries or a numerous group of historical teachers. Ever since its establishment in 1921 this committee has been active in the work of devising and broadcasting suggestions as to means and methods by which college teachers so placed may overcome the handicap, and take part in that work of historical research without which even very good teachers are likely to dry up or become ossified. After a description of the purposes and efforts of the committee by Dr. Boyd, Professor E. Merton Coulter, of the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

University of Georgia, read a paper on the Collecting of Historical Material, replete with useful suggestions as to ways in which the college teacher and his students can carry on that work, especially in the collecting of material for the history of the state or the local region. Professor William W. Sweet, of De Pauw University, in his paper on Pertinent Fields of Research in Colleges, also laid stress on the opportunities they afford for local and state history; secondly, he emphasized the advantages they often possess, in denominational materials and otherwise, for contributions in the field of social and religious history. Encouraging examples of energy and success in such endeavors were brought forward.

In this conference there was real discussion, by Professors Jernegan and Dodd, of Chicago, and others, in which many practical hints as to methods and materials were given, and some stimulating suggestions as to the reflected influence which such work might exert on the college students and on the community. One speaker challenged the "basic assumption" underlying the conference that all college teachers should engage in research; but this was beside the mark. There was no such assumption. The main business of a teacher is to teach; to this everyone present would have agreed. But some teachers—in general, the live ones—will somehow find some time for investigation, and the purpose of the conference was to discuss what they can do and how they can be helped.

Especial interest attached to a luncheon conference of a variety the Association had never had before, a conference of those interested in Slavonic history. Interest in that field has been growing somewhat steadily in America since the World War, and advantage was taken of the presence of Professor R. W. Seton-Watson, among the British delegates, to organize a consultation respecting such studies. Through the untiring efforts of Professor Arthur I. Andrews, a company of about a hundred and fifty was brought together at the luncheon. Professor Michael Rostovtzeff, of the University of Wisconsin, addressed them on the Main Lines of Development of Modern Historical Scholarship in Russia, adverting especially to achievements in archaeology, in Byzantine history, and in the history of the Eastern Church, and considering also some of the problems raised by present-day censorship and repression. Professor Frank A. Golder, of Stanford University, followed with several practical suggestions. Professor Seton-Watson discussed the possibilities of co-operation of British and American scholars in Slavonic studies, and the programme of the *Slavonic Review*. The appointment of three American scholars as associate editors of that valuable journal

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is one important step in establishing the co-operation desired. Other practical steps are likely to result in the future from the conference just described.

It is the custom of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association to hold each year one of its semiannual meetings at the same time and place with the annual meeting of the American Historical Association. At Richmond it held one joint session with the latter society, at which five papers were read; they may better be described at a later point in this chronicle, in the places into which they naturally fall amid the summaries of papers read in other sessions. The Mississippi Valley society also had a subscription dinner, at which Professor William E. Dodd, of the University of Chicago, read an account, marked by his usual keen insight, of a Great Debate in American History—the Virginia Convention of 1829–1830, treating that dramatic struggle between eastern and western Virginia in relation to the economic forces involved and in the light of later events.

Another affiliated organization sharing in the Richmond meeting was the Agricultural History Society. This body likewise had a joint meeting with the larger society, with four papers, and a subscription dinner. At the latter, Professor Ulrich B. Phillips, of the University of Michigan, read an admirable paper on Plantations with Slave Labor and Free, which we shall have the pleasure of laying before our readers in a later number of this journal.

Before proceeding to speak of individual papers, in some systematic order, most conveniently an order approximately chronological, the chronicler is moved, in the capacity of the "candid friend", to make one general criticism—namely, that nearly half of those who appeared on the programme read their contributions badly, in many cases so badly that they were not well understood. Any paper gains tenfold in effect by being well presented. On the other hand, it is plainly a futile thing to prepare a good paper, come some hundreds of miles to present it, and then read it in so low or thick a voice, with so slovenly a pronunciation, or in so careless a manner, that it is unintelligible to many or most of those who wish to hear. Is it, one is tempted to ask of productions so offered, as of the many ill-written manuscripts that come to the editorial desk, is it written solely for the author's own satisfaction, or is it written with any thought of the "ultimate consumer"?

In the field of ancient history, four papers were presented. Professor Allen B. West, of Wheaton College, showed that after the Peace of Nicias, requiring Athens to reduce the tribute levied on her allies, her assessment of 421 B. C. actually reduced the tribute to

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sums not greatly above those originally prescribed by Aristides. Miss Susan H. Ballou, of Bryn Mawr College, described the Occupations of Women in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, showing the large degree of economic freedom enjoyed by women, their business interests, the range of their industrial pursuits, domestic or in factories, their employment in agriculture and in nursing. Professor Michael Rostovtzeff, of the University of Wisconsin, spoke on Augustus as Reflected in the Monuments of Art of his Period, dwelling especially on the effort of the imperator to present, by means of beautiful artistic creations, an impressive and elaborate account of his main ideas and achievements, with purposes not dissimilar to those underlying the *Res Gestae*. Professor Herbert Wing, jr., of Dickinson College, related the story of Athens under the Romans from Sulla to Arcadius.

In a session devoted to general medieval history Professor James F. Willard, of the University of Colorado, dealt with the subject of Inland Transportation in England in the Fourteenth Century. The isolation of the manor and the impassable quality of the roads, he held, had been too much emphasized. A study of local and national records of the fourteenth century shows that carts were in constant use, and that heavy goods could be carried on the roads during the winter, pack-horses being for the most part used locally or to transport light or precious goods, while there was also much use of river boats. Professor F. M. Powicke, of the University of Manchester, described the proposed Catalogue of Latin Incipits, suggested at the International Historical Congress at Brussels, and made a plea for American co-operation in the work of compiling such a list.

One of the outstanding papers of the meeting was that of the Rev. Alexander J. Carlyle, of University College, Oxford, on the Medieval Conception of the Supremacy of Law and the Beginnings of the Theory of Sovereignty. In the Middle Ages, he said, the idea of sovereignty was quite unknown. The supreme authority was not a king or emperor or even a community, but law. Gratian declared that the human race was ruled by natural law and by custom. According to medieval jurists natural law, the equivalent of true reason, was supreme. Custom might be overridden. The theory of sovereignty arose from a realization of the progress of society, which outran custom, and from the revived study of Roman law.

Another interesting paper in the same session was that of Professor Charles H. Haskins, of Harvard University, on the Spread of Ideas in the Middle Ages. Its history is, he held, only in part a

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

history of slow diffusion through the resisting medium of local habit and custom. It is mainly concerned with communication between scattered centres of the same type, chiefly monasteries, courts, towns, and universities. The rôle of each of these was indicated and illustrated by specific examples, and emphasis was laid upon the importance of further study of medieval roads viewed as lines of intellectual intercourse. The work of Bédier and of Kingsley Porter was cited as an example of what might be done by a combined attack on such problems on the part of historians, geographers, philologists, and archaeologists. At the end of the session Professor Louis J. Paetow, of the University of California, read the report of a Committee on Medieval Latin Studies appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies. Its text will be found in *Bulletin No. 3* of that Council. Briefly, it dwelt chiefly on the international effort, in which America through the Council has a part, toward a dictionary of medieval Latin, and on a proposed journal of medieval studies.

Another session was devoted specifically to English history. Miss Mary Hayden, professor in University College, Dublin, read a paper on Perkin Warbeck, citing evidence that Warbeck was set up as part of the plot in the Earl of Warwick's interest. In spite of statements to the contrary by contemporary English authorities, it does not appear that the native Irish, who were at this time concerning themselves little with the political affairs of England, supported Warbeck during any of his three visits to Ireland, or took any interest in his claims. His adherents whose names we know were all, with the exception of one bishop, Anglo-Irishmen.

The paper read in this session by Professor Albert F. Pollard, of the University of London, on Some Unexplored Fields in English Constitutional History, aroused much interest. Limiting himself to one or two topics which have some bearing on American history as well, he discussed the opinions rendered by the judges in the Exchequer Chamber, as interpreters of the English constitution in the centuries from the fifteenth to the seventeenth. From the Year Books and law reports of that time we may learn the ideas of constitutional government brought by the earliest colonists to America, or deliberately rejected by their emigration. Much co-operative work in local as well as national sources is required in order to understand the growth of Parliament in its true historical perspective and to trace accurately the growth of those ideas of sovereignty and state, over which the mother country and colonists came into conflict. Another interesting English paper, by Dr. J. H. Clapham, of King's College, Cambridge, was on the Housing Question in Great Britain

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a Century Ago, in which he analyzed and contrasted the housing conditions in England and Scotland from 1815 to 1840. Professor William T. Laprade, of Trinity College, North Carolina, discussed the Growth of National Consciousness in England, attributing it chiefly to the necessity of co-operation, on the part of those having substantial interests at stake, in a succession of struggles against the Roman Church, the Hapsburgs, the Stuart dynasty, Holland, France, Prussia, and Germany.

Three papers on modern Europe in the period before the most recent were given in a later session. Professor Franklin C. Palm, of the University of California, read a paper on Henry of Montmorency-Damville, leader of the Politiques in southern France during the Wars of Religion, and on the importance of his final alliance with the house of Bourbon. Professor Mitchell B. Garrett, of Howard College, Alabama, set forth the Controversy over the Composition of the States-General, in the months from August to December, 1788, his paper being based on the study of the pamphlet literature published at the time in France, with especial reference to the argument, finally successful, that the Third Estate should have half of the deputies. From Rumanian sources and papers in the Public Record Office Professor Thad W. Riker, of the University of Texas, discussed the International Crisis of 1857 over Moldavia. The Congress of Paris had left the question of a union of the Danubian principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia to a plebiscite of the inhabitants, pending the final decision of the Powers. The effort of the Porte to manipulate the electoral lists in Moldavia in such a manner as to ensure a vote against union divided the Powers into two opposing camps, France being backed by Russia, Prussia, and Sardinia, while Great Britain and Austria rallied to the support of the Turks, the main diplomatic battle being between the French and British ambassadors at Constantinople, Thouvenel and Stratford de Redcliffe. A serious situation was relieved only by the pact of Osborne by which Napoleon III. renounced the cause of union in consideration of new elections in Moldavia, after which the Rumanians, acquiring the initiative, were able themselves to bring about the desired union. Miss Lucy E. Textor, professor in Vassar College, read a paper on the National Aspect of Recent Agrarian Reform in Eastern Europe, holding that the expropriations of estates have been for the most part beneficent, but that some discrimination against racial minorities has shown itself in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, and Jugoslavia.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the evening devoted to the question, What remains to be done for the Development of the History of the British Empire, Professor Charles K. Webster, of the University of Wales, read an informing and suggestive paper, to be printed later in these pages, on What remains to be done for the History of the Foreign Policy of the Empire in the Nineteenth Century? He adverted to the appalling copiousness of the materials, argued against the superficial view that whatever is essential is already known, described the pitfalls and the cautions which must be observed in the use of despatches, drafts, and memoranda in the Foreign Office papers,[3] reminded students of the auxiliary value of papers of other British departments and of former sovereigns and ministers, urged the search of foreign archives, and discussed briefly the relations of the newspaper press to the foreign policy of Great Britain.

In the second of the evening's papers, on the Constitutional Relations between Great Britain and the British West Indies in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries, Professor Robert L. Schuyler, of Columbia University, showed by various instances, especially that of the Slave Registration Bill proposed in Parliament in 1815, that the doctrine of the American revolutionists, that Parliament was not sovereign over the colonies but, on the contrary, was bound by fundamental law, was not abandoned in the West Indies until the reduction of their assemblies in the third quarter of the nineteenth century.

The third paper of the evening was a candid and thoughtful discourse, by Professor Basil Williams, of McGill University, on the Need of a Comparative History of British and Foreign Colonial Developments, dwelling upon the instruction which British administrators and public men might derive from a closer study of the methods of other colonizing nations, and upon the interest which the historian would find in tracing, comparatively, the ways in which those nations have developed and applied the modern idea of trusteeship of colonies.

[3] In view of recent action of the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, in enlarging from 1860 to 1878 the period for which the Foreign Office papers in the Public Record Office are thrown open to historical study, the Anglo-American Conference of Professors of History voted, with the concurrence of the Executive Council of the Association:

"That both British and American students of modern history are deeply sensible of the benefit conferred upon their studies by the recent decision of the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs throwing open to investigation the records of the Foreign Office down to the date of 1878, and wish to put on record an expression of their appreciation:

"That they venture to express the hope that a system may result whereby from time to time or at stated intervals the Foreign Office records of additional years or periods since 1878 may automatically be thrown open."

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The final paper, by Professor George M. Wrong, of Toronto, traced the Evolution of the Problem of Foreign Relations in the British Empire. Though the American Revolution did not lead to any change of outlook in Britain as to colonial policy, the increased importance of the dominions, combined with the advent of democracy in the old country, brought them forward, by well-marked stages, to their present status of international personality. In Canadian history the earlier landmarks are, the adoption of free trade in Great Britain in 1846, and Canadian federation in 1867. But in the last few years the signing of the Versailles treaty, and the securing of the right to make separate treaties elsewhere, have with striking rapidity advanced the status of the dominions in the empire.

To these latest years belong the topics which made the final evening session one of the most interesting of the whole convention. Professor Sidney B. Fay, of Smith College, spoke on the Immediate Origin of the World War, Major Harold Temperley, of Peterhouse, Cambridge, England, on Peacemaking from 1919 to 1923. Modern topics truly, on which the historian well knows that more light is yet to be cast, but on which he may nevertheless with propriety make now his contribution—especially if he treats them with the competency, calm, and fairness always shown by Professor Fay. Assuming some knowledge of the conclusions expressed by him in articles in this journal four years ago,[4] he confined his discussion to the new light which has since been cast on two matters, the murder of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and the Russian mobilization. He reasoned from the revelations of Ljuba Jovanovitch, minister of education in the Pashitch cabinet, that the assassins were closely connected with the Serbian Black Hand, the leading spirit of which was the chief of the intelligence division of the Serbian general staff, and that Austria was right in suspecting such relations, though she had no adequate proof. He analyzed the new Russian material on the July crisis of 1914, and showed that the true course of events was widely different from what was stated by Sukhomlinov; nor was the Tsar's decision caused either by the *Lokalanzeiger* episode or by the news of general mobilization in Austria. The paper must have increased the desire of many students to see the book which Professor Fay is understood to be preparing on the whole subject of the immediate origins of the war. In the discussion which followed, Professor Seton-Watson discredited some of the testimony as to Serbia, and declined to believe in the sincerity of Germany's eleventh-hour endeavors to avert the conflict.

[4] "New Light on the Origins of the World War", *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXV. 616–639, XXVI. 37–53, 225–254.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Temperley, in discussing the peace settlement of 1919, called to mind the procedure of 1815 at Vienna, showed the resemblances and the differences, examined the relation of the results to President Wilson's Fourteen Points, and compared the congress-procedure of 1815–1822 with the methods pursued for the concert of nations since 1919.

As on some previous occasions, one session was devoted to the history of the Far East. Professor Louis H. Hodous, of the Hartford Theological Seminary, described the Early Stages in the Propagation and Establishment of Buddhism in China, its slow diffusion over that country in the second half of the second century A. D., its temporary alliance with Taoism, and its results. Mr. Carroll B. Malone, of Denison University and Tsinghua College, Peking, treated of the First Remission of the Boxer Indemnity, which he traced, by means of unpublished Chinese official documents, to the years 1904 and 1905, when Secretary Hay and the Chinese minister Liang began to make plans for this remission, and when the latter suggested to his home government that the money should be used for educational purposes. The matter was then traced, through the activity of President Roosevelt and of Congress, down to the voluntary proposal by China that the money returned should be used for the education of Chinese students in the United States. Mr. Eldon Griffin, of Yale University, emphasized the value of the Teaching of Far Eastern, Asiatic, and Pacific History to Undergraduates, and described appropriate methods for such instruction.

Turning now to American history, we have to consider first a group of contributions to the history of the colonial period. Professor Herbert E. Bolton, of the University of California, presented a paper, new in content, on the Spanish Resistance to the Carolina Traders, 1680–1704, a period of struggle between the Spanish and the English for possession of the Georgia country. By 1680 the Spanish not only had a chain of settlements along the coast from St. Mary's to Port Royal, but had planted centres of influence among most of the coast tribes, and had even made some tentative penetration of the country as far as the Chattahoochee. With the founding of Carolina the contest for possession of the Georgia country became especially active and was kept up, with but brief occasional lulls, until 1763. On the English side a principal part was taken by the Carolinian traders, while the Indians, sometimes allied with the one side, sometimes with the other, were pawns in the game. The Spanish were by degrees driven back, although with now and again a turn of fortune in their favor. The particular contribution of Professor

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Verner W. Crane, of Brown University, in his paper on Projects for Colonization in the South, 1684–1732, was in showing that the founding of Georgia was not an isolated episode, but was in fact the culmination of a series of projects during half a century for English occupation of the disputed region beyond the Savannah River. Although these projects were failures, due to specific weaknesses and to the lack of an effective impulse to colonization, until this was supplied (1730–1732) by the organized forces of piety and philanthropy, they reveal a transition to a new era of colonization, with the westward movement as the setting, and with imperial rivalry—especially Anglo-French rivalry—as the significant motive. The imperialist programme of the South Carolinians, on the other hand, had the definite result of leading the Board of Trade to develop a new western policy, that of strengthening the southern frontier and checking the encroachments of the French. The paper of Mr. J. G. Johnson, of the University of Colorado, dealt with the Border Struggle between Florida and Georgia during the decade, 1733–1742, following the establishment of the latter colony, and described briefly the unsuccessful efforts to establish a boundary, the erection of frontier fortifications, the encouragement given by the two contestants to Indian forays into the territory of the other, and emphasized the extreme reluctance with which the Spaniards relinquished their claim to the Georgia coast.

Appropriately, one session was devoted to Virginian history, and two of the papers then read illustrated portions of colonial history. Professor Percy S. Flippin, of Mercer University, described the successful career of William Gooch as governor of Virginia, indicating the various lines of his activity, and attributing his success to native abilities combined with a constant habit of regard for colonial interests. Under the title, Neglected Phases of the Revolution in Virginia, Mr. Isaac D. Harrell, of New York University, showed from the books of the state land office and the auditor how great an influence was exerted by the grants of land west of the mountains, during the Revolution, by the contraction of the currency and other forms of financial pressure just before it, and by the debts due to British subjects. Professor Dumas Malone, of the University of Virginia, gave an account of the relations of Thomas Cooper and Thomas Jefferson, based largely on their long-continued correspondence, with special attention to the episode of Jefferson's unsuccessful attempt to bring his friend to the University of Virginia as its first professor. The remaining paper, that of Professor James E. Walmsley, of Winthrop College, on the Change of Secession Senti-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment in Virginia in 1861, belongs to a later period, and indeed consisted in the presentation of a series of significant letters, which later will find a place in our section devoted to documents. Another aspect of Virginian history was treated in a session of the Agricultural History Society, by Mr. Oscar C. Stine, of the United States Department of Agriculture, under the title, Wheat Growing in Colonial Virginia.

It is hoped that we may be able to print before long the paper in which Professor Claude H. Van Tyne, of the University of Michigan, described the course of French relations to the American colonies from the Peace of 1763 down to the alliance of 1778, with especial attention to the secret aid given by the British government during more than eighteen months preceding the treaty of alliance and open aid. We may therefore omit further summary of it, and pass on to the period subsequent to the Revolution.

Professor Beverley W. Bond, jr., of the University of Cincinnati, in a paper entitled the Miami Purchase, a Western Propriety, described the work of Judge John Cleves Symmes in organizing and settling the Miami Purchase. In developing his property, Symmes employed, when applicable, the proprietary custom of East Jersey, with which he was familiar. The settlement of the Miami Purchase therefore illustrates the persistence of old customs and the use that was made of them west of the Appalachians. Professor William F. Galpin, of the University of Oklahoma, narrated the rise and fall of the Anglo-American Grain Trade during the years 1783–1815. The volume of this trade increased until 1807, when it reached its maximum. Declining in the following year, it came to an end with the War of 1812. The causes of these changes were described, the legislation affecting the trade was discussed, and the origin of the trade within the United States was pointed out. Professor Charles H. Ambler, of the West Virginia University, treated of Shipbuilding on the Ohio River during 1800–1808 and 1845–1860, when the building of ships on that river was stimulated by the European demand for American food products. The ships of the earlier period traded chiefly with the lower Mississippi and the West Indies, while those of the later period traded with the East and Europe. Professor Everett S. Brown, of the University of Michigan, in a paper on the Presidential Election of 1824–1825, emphasized the outstanding importance of the personal element in that election both in the selection of candidates and in the final choice of President, and showed how fully this phase of the election is illustrated by the letters of William Plumer, jr., of New Hampshire, who was in close personal touch

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with all four of the candidates. Henry W. McLaughlin's paper on the Henry B. Jones Diary, the Annals of a Virginia Planter, 1842–1881, consisted chiefly of extracts from the diary, giving interesting details of the life of an enterprising farmer during the middle years of the nineteenth century.

Miss Margaret Brown O'Connor, of St. Louis, in a paper entitled the Blairs and the Election of 1860, discoursed upon the large parts which three members of one family, Francis Preston Blair and his two sons, Montgomery and Frank, played in the beginnings of the Republican party and the election of Lincoln to the presidency. The elder Blair, as the friend of Jackson and editor of the *Globe,* had wielded extraordinary political influence, and the political and social intimacies of the family had extensive ramifications and influences in Missouri and elsewhere. It was in great measure the genius of the elder Blair that out of the political wreckage of the late 'fifties organized the Republican party. Even until the final ballot in the national convention, the Blairs supported the candidacy of Edward Bates, but in the end they brought their forces over to the side of Lincoln, and, in the campaign which followed, Frank Blair in particular was one of the most active and effective speakers. Of his part in the campaign Miss O'Connor gave an intimate picture.

Very suitably to place and occasion, one general afternoon session was devoted to a group of papers, five in number, and above the average in quality, on the history of the Confederacy. Not a few of those present could remember times when the conduct and leaders and problems of the Confederacy were themes of heated debate. It was very interesting to hear them now discussed so calmly, by men of the younger generation, who plainly had no bias, and in all their investigations sought only the truth. Professor Charles W. Ramsdell, of the University of Texas, discussed the Problem of Morale of the Confederacy. As the chief cause of the growing apathy he emphasized the failure of Confederate leaders to direct and strengthen public opinion in a society so individualistic as was the South. As a result of this failure, disaffection from various causes began to appear: conscription and impressment became unpopular; the poor suffered while speculation and extortion throve; illegal trade, especially in cotton, promoted disloyalty; the disintegration of administration in regions distant from the capital weakened confidence in the government; and finally the shock of military disaster so weakened the morale and nullified the efforts to strengthen the armies that utter collapse followed.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Disagreeing with those who would attribute the failure of the Confederacy to inadequate industrial, financial, and transportation facilities, Professor Frank Owsley, of Vanderbilt University, in an essay on State Rights and the Breakdown of the Confederacy, put forward as the chief weakness of the South the very principle for which it had seceded, state rights. The states assumed functions whose exercise must of necessity devolve upon the central government in time of war if success is to be expected. For local defense they withheld arms and munitions from the central government, thereby greatly reducing the size of the army that could have been raised in 1861, and later withdrew many thousands from general service into state organizations. They tried to furnish supplies from home and foreign markets to their own troops, at the expense of the army as a whole. Thirdly, the state-rights party successfully opposed the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, in consequence of which deserters and draft-dodgers escaped service, and spies and disloyal persons enjoyed freedom. Finally, opposition, on grounds of state sovereignty, to the impressment policy and to conscription laws, further weakened the government where it particularly needed strengthening, in the procuring of supplies and in man power.

In a paper entitled General Joseph Eggleston Johnston, Storm Centre of the Confederate Army, Professor Alfred P. James, of the University of Pittsburgh, drew an interesting parallel between Johnston and McClellan, and described the conflict into which Johnston and Jefferson Davis were drawn by disagreement over military strategy. But Johnston's opposition to the administration was more than individual. He was backed by an extremely influential group of relatives and, as the war progressed, by a large following, including prominent figures in military and social life, upon whom he could rely for support. He represented the old up-country element in the ante-bellum sectionalism of Virginia. Partly by his own activity, but possibly more by the natural cohesion of opposition, Johnston headed what was virtually a military faction in the Confederacy.

Mr. A. Sellew Roberts, of the University of Illinois, described the Rewards of the Blockade Runner, citing many specific instances of sales and profits in blockade running, showing a rate of gain of from 400 to 1200 per cent. to the successful adventurer who not only carried out cotton but also contracted with the Confederate government for the importation of military supplies. Another matter of Confederate economics had already been considered at a session for agricultural history, in a paper by Professor E. Merton Coulter, of Georgia, on Agricultural Development in the Lower South during

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Civil War. He gave an excellent account of the agitation for the growing of corn, wheat, cane, fruits, and other food crops, instead of cotton. This agitation was followed by the necessary legislation and the new crops were grown abundantly. By reason of this mixed husbandry the South was not starved into submission. Whatever suffering there was from want of food was caused by the failure of transportation.

The paper of Professor Roy F. Nichols, of Columbia University, on the United States *v.* Jefferson Davis, 1865–1869, considered two questions: Why was Jefferson Davis never tried? Why was he kept so long in jeopardy? As to the first, distrust of the qualifications of the federal law officers in Virginia, where the trial must be held, caused government counsel to decide that the prosecution should be made before Chief Justice Chase in the circuit court. Chase's scruples about possible conflict between military and civil jurisdictions, the unsettled condition of Virginia, and Congressional carelessness, resulted in a delay of nearly two years, during which time the difficulties involved in conducting a satisfactory and dignified trial became more and more apparent to the government's legal force, who lost interest and confidence in the trial. In answer to the second question, fear of popular disapproval, political complications, and personal animosity all played their part. The case had been started and the arrangements made for prosecuting it, yet no one seemed willing to assume the responsibility for finally disposing of it until four years after Davis's arrest.

Of the long period of fifty-five years of American history since 1869, only one paper had anything to say, that of Professor John C. Parish, of the Southern Branch of the University of California, on Persistence of the Westward Movement. He pointed out that, although the frontier as commonly conceived had by 1890 reached the coast, nevertheless the westward movement in its larger phases did not then cease but had persisted during the past generation as a factor in our national life. A westward movement of population is seen in the development of large urban centres in the West through immigration. But especially significant in this period had been the westward movement of material frontiers, such as those of intensive farming, development of natural resources, transportation, manufacturing, banking, and finally, though more slowly, the frontier of culture. These phases of the westward movement have essentially modified the characteristics of the earlier frontier.

In the business meeting of the Association, a memorial of President Woodrow Wilson was read by Professor Andrews, and one of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Gaillard Hunt by Dr. H. B. Learned. The secretary reported a membership, on December 15, of 2790, a gain of 212 during the past year. The treasurer's report showed net receipts of $15,135, against net expenditures of $14,072. A summary of this report, together with the budget voted for 1925, is printed at the end of this article. The par value of all the society's endowments was stated to amount to $43,600. The Committee on Endowment was reorganized, Professor Evarts B. Greene being made its chairman, and Professor Henry M. Wriston executive secretary. The expectation is, that this committee, of whose plans a fuller statement is made on a later page,[5] shall raise $200,000 in addition to the present endowment. The undertaking was presented and explained to the meeting, and received with warm approval; a member of the Council, Professor Paxson, had already, in only five hours of informal effort among some of the members present, secured pledges of $2500.

Reports from various committees were submitted, as also an informal one from Professor E. Douglas Adams on behalf of the Pacific Coast Branch. To those to whom the better writing of history in the United States is an important object of desire, it will be good news that the report of the special committee on that subject will be ready for print as soon as its chairman, Mr. Jusserand, has written a portion which would engage his attention as soon as possible after his return to France.

The committee on the Justin Winsor Prize reported a recommendation that it should be awarded to Miss Elizabeth B. White, of Ursinus College, for a manuscript on the History of Franco-American Diplomatic Relations, with honorable mention of one of Professor Reginald C. McGrane on William Allen, a Study of Frontier Democracy, and of Mr. Hume Wrong's *Government of the West Indies*.[6] The George Louis Beer Prize was awarded to Professor Alfred L. P. Dennis, of Clark University, for his volume on *The Foreign Policies of Soviet Russia*.[7] An additional prize was instituted, the Jusserand Medal, for the best work in the history of intellectual relations between America and one or more European countries. It was resolved by the Council that hereafter the award of prizes should be formally announced in one of the public sessions of the Association.

The Council had also provided for representation of the Association, and thus of the United States, in the permanent International Committee of the Historical Sciences provided for by the Brussels

[5] See p. 660, *post*.

[6] Oxford University Press, 1923 (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXIX. 615).

[7] New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, 1924 (*ibid.*, XXIX. 772).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congress of 1923; Messrs. Waldo G. Leland and James T. Shotwell were appointed. It had voted that a fresh list of members should be printed, and should be sent to members along with the April number of this journal. It had arranged, on a limited scale, for an exchange of publications with the English Historical Association, in accordance with which a certain number of copies of several of that society's historical pamphlets will be available for gratuitous distribution to such members of the American Historical Association as may desire them.[8] A vote of the Council regarding the projected *Dictionary of American Biography,* expressing gratitude to Mr. Adolph S. Ochs and the New York *Times* Company for the generosity which has made that enterprise possible, was ratified by the Association with cordial feeling.

An amendment to the constitution was adopted by the Association, intended to obviate all difficulty in case of any vacancy in the office of president, by providing for immediate succession and differentiating the two vice-presidents. The text of the amendment will be found at the end of the present article.

On recommendation of the Council it was voted that the next annual meeting should be held at Ann Arbor in the closing days of December. Professor Charles M. Andrews was elected president of the Association, Professor Dana C. Munro first vice-president, Dr. Henry Osborn Taylor second vice-president. Professor John S. Bassett and Dr. Charles Moore were re-elected secretary and treasurer respectively. Two new members were elected to the Council, Professors William K. Boyd and Nellie Neilson. The Committee on Nominations elected for the ensuing year consisted of Professor Charles D. Hazen, chairman, Arthur C. Cole, Frances G. Davenport, Payson J. Treat, and Edward R. Turner. The Executive Council elected Professor Sidney B. Fay a member of the Board of Editors of this journal in succession to Professor Coolidge. A full list of committee assignments for 1925 follows this article.

J. F. J.

Amendment to the Constitution

Article IV. of the constitution was amended to read as follows, the words in italics representing new matter:

> The officers shall be a president, *a first vice-president, a second vice-president,* a secretary, a treasurer, an assistant secretary-treasurer, and an editor.
>
> The president, vice-presidents, secretary, and treasurer shall be elected by ballot at each regular annual meeting in the manner provided in the by-laws.

[8] See p. 660, *post.*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The assistant secretary-treasurer and the editor shall be elected by the executive council. They shall perform such duties and receive such compensation as the council may determine.

If the office of president shall, through any cause, become vacant, the first vice-president shall thereupon become president, and the second vice-president shall become first vice-president whenever the office of first vice-president shall have been vacated.

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements

RECEIPTS

Annual dues		$13,063.41
American Historical Review, contribution		1,000.00
Registration fees		212.00
Publications		160.49
Royalties		45.70
Contribution to Endowment Fund	$ 26.28	
Refund on Endowment Fund	1,106.36	1,132.64
Refund on investment		94.66
Interest:		
Endowment Fund	1,154.80	
Andrew D. White Fund	56.72	
George L. Beer Prize Fund	286.25	
Bank Balance	104.63	1,602.40
Miscellaneous		24.95
Total receipts		$17,336.25
Cash balances, December 1, 1923		7,457.76[9]
		$24,794.01

DISBURSEMENTS

Secretary and Treasurer		$2,993.15
Pacific Coast Branch		28.50
Committees of Management:		
Nominations	$53.75	
Membership	11.58	
Programme	337.38	
Local Arrangements	63.00	
Executive Council	273.52	
Endowment	250.93	
Treasurer's contingent fund	42.00	1,032.16
Historical Activities:		
Bibliography	754.51	
Publications	1,292.37	

[9] This balance differs from that shown in last year's statement in that the figures now include the cash balance in the Endowment Fund, which was not then taken into account.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conference of Historical Societies	25.00	
Writings on American History	200.00	
American Council of Learned Societies	128.90	
Historical Research in Colleges	13.75	
Historical Teaching in Schools	13.59	
International Committee of Historical Sciences	92.66	2,520.78
Prizes:		
Herbert Baxter Adams	200.00	
George Louis Beer	500.00	700.00
American Historical Review		6,797.55
Transferred to Endowment Fund		2,150.00
Total disbursements		$16,222.14
Cash balances, November 30, 1924		8,571.87
		$24,794.01

ENDOWMENT FUNDS

	Cost	Par Value
Principal account	$30,830.50	$31,200.00
American Historical Review Fund	1,134.64	1,200.00
Herbert Baxter Adams Prize	4,900.00	5,000.00
Andrew D. White Fund	1,183.00 [10]	1,200.00
George Louis Beer Prize Fund	5,002.50 [10]	5,000.00
	$43,050.64	$43,600.00

BUDGET, 1925

Receipts:		
Annual Dues	$13,000.00	
Interest on endowment and bank balances	2,500.00	
Royalties	50.00	
Publications	150.00	
Registration fees	175.00	
Miscellaneous	25.00	
		$15,900.00
Disbursements:		
Office of Secretary and Treasurer	$3,000.00	
Pacific Coast Branch	50.00	
Committees of Management:		
Committee on Nominations	100.00	
Committee on Membership	100.00	
Committee on Programme	350.00	
Committee on Local Arrangements	150.00	
Executive Council	500.00	
Endowment Fund	1,000.00	
Treasurer's contingent fund	200.00	

[10] These values vary in some instances from those listed last year, owing to changes in investments during the year.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Historical Activities:	
Committee on Bibliography	500.00
Committee on Publications	700.00
Conference of Historical Societies	25.00
Public Archives Commission	100.00
Writings on American History	200.00
American Council of Learned Societies	170.00
Committee on Historical Research in Colleges	50.00
Committee on History Teaching in the Schools	500.00
International Committee of Historical Science	100.00
Prizes:	
Justin Winsor Prize for 1924	200.00
George Louis Beer Prize for 1924	250.00
American Historical Review	7,000.00
Printing List of Members	200.00
	$15,445.00

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

President, Charles M. Andrews, Yale University, New Haven.
First Vice-President, Dana C. Munro, Princeton University, Princeton.
Second Vice-President, Henry O. Taylor, 135 East 66th St., New York.
Secretary, John S. Bassett, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
Treasurer, Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington.[11]
Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Patty W. Washington, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington.
Editor, Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington.
Executive Council (in addition to the above-named officers):

James Ford Rhodes [12]
John B. McMaster
Simeon E. Baldwin
J. Franklin Jameson
George B. Adams
Albert Bushnell Hart
Frederick J. Turner
William M. Sloane
Andrew C. McLaughlin
George L. Burr
Worthington C. Ford
Edward Channing
Jules Jusserand
Charles H. Haskins
Edward P. Cheyney [12]
Henry P. Biggar
William K. Boyd
Carlton J. H. Hayes
Charles H. McIlwain
Nellie Neilson
Frederic L. Paxson
Arthur M. Schlesinger
Mary W. Williams

[11] For the purposes of routine business the treasurer may be addressed at 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

[12] The names from that of Mr. Rhodes to that of Mr. Cheyney are those of ex-presidents.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMMITTEES:

Committee on Programme for the Fortieth Annual Meeting: William E. Dodd, University of Chicago, chairman; Annie H. Abel-Henderson, Eugene H. Byrne, St. George L. Sioussat, Preston W. Slosson, Nathaniel W. Stephenson; and (*ex officio*) Herbert A. Kellar and Joseph Schafer.

Committee on Local Arrangements: William A. Frayer, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, chairman; Preston W. Slosson, University of Michigan, secretary.

Committee on Nominations: Charles D. Hazen, Columbia University, New York, chairman; Arthur C. Cole, Frances G. Davenport, Payson J. Treat, E. Raymond Turner.

Editors of the American Historical Review: Guy S. Ford, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, chairman; Francis A. Christie, William E. Dodd, Sidney B. Fay, Evarts B. Greene, J. Franklin Jameson.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: Theodore C. Pease, University of Illinois, Urbana, chairman; Eugene C. Barker, Beverley W. Bond, Clarence E. Carter, Bernard C. Steiner. *Subcommittee on Manuscripts from Europe:* Randolph G. Adams, Lawrence C. Worth.

Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize: C. Mildred Thompson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., chairman; James T. Adams, Chauncey S. Boucher, Allan Nevins, Carl Wittke.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize: William T. Laprade, Duke University, chairman; Frederic Duncalf, Richard A. Newhall, Bertha H. Putnam, Henry R. Shipman.

Public Archives Commission: John W. Oliver, University of Pittsburgh, chairman; Solon J. Buck, John H. Edmonds, Robert B. House, Waldo G. Leland, Thomas M. Marshall, James G. Randall.

Committee on Bibliography: George M. Dutcher, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., chairman; William H. Allison, Solon J. Buck, Sidney B. Fay, Louis J. Paetow, Augustus H. Shearer, Henry R. Shipman.

Committee on Bibliography of Modern English History: Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, chairman; Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Wallace Notestein, Conyers Read.

Committee on Publications: H. Barrett Learned, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, chairman; Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington, secretary; and (*ex officio*) John S. Bassett, J. Franklin Jameson, Theodore C. Pease, St. George L. Sioussat, O. C. Stine.

Committee on Membership: Austin P. Evans, Columbia University, New York, chairman; Robert G. Albion, Witt Bowden, Ralph H. Gabriel, Paul Knaplund, Ella Lonn, Donald L. McMurry, Frederick Merk, Laurence B. Packard, Franklin C. Palm, Ulrich B. Phillips, William W. Pierson, jr., Charles W. Ramsdell, J. Fred Rippy.

Conference of Historical Societies: Benjamin F. Shambaugh, Iowa City, Iowa, chairman; Joseph Schafer, Wisconsin State Historical Society, secretary.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Committee on the National Archives: J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, chairman; Tyler Dennett, Charles Moore, Eben Putnam, Oliver L. Spaulding, jr.

Editors of the Historical Outlook: Albert E. McKinley, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, managing editor; Edgar Dawson, Sarah A. Dynes, Daniel C. Knowlton, Laurence M. Larson, William L. Westermann.

Committee on Hereditary Patriotic Societies: Dixon R. Fox, Columbia University, New York, chairman; George S. Godard, Natalie S. Lincoln, Mrs. Annie L. Sioussat.

Committee on History Teaching in the Schools: A. C. Krey, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, chairman. This committee is in process of reorganization.

Committee on Endowment: Evarts B. Greene, Kent Hall, Columbia University, New York, chairman; Henry M. Wriston, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., executive secretary; Charles M. Andrews, John S. Bassett, Albert J. Beveridge, Guy S. Ford, Worthington C. Ford, Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson, H. Barrett Learned, Stewart L. Mims, Charles Moore, Dana C. Munro, Otto L. Schmidt.

Committee on Obtaining Transcripts from Foreign Archives: Charles M. Andrews, 424 St. Ronan Street, New Haven, chairman; Waldo G. Leland, Wallace Notestein.

Delegates in the American Council of Learned Societies: Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson.

Committee on the George L. Beer Prize: Bernadotte E. Schmitt, 2076 East 88th Street, Cleveland, chairman; George H. Blakeslee, Robert H. Lord, Jesse S. Reeves, Robert L. Schuyler.

Committee on Historical Research in Colleges: William K. Boyd, Duke University, chairman; E. Merton Coulter, Asa E. Martin, St. George L. Sioussat, William W. Sweet.

Committee on the Writing of History: Jules Jusserand, Paris, France, chairman; Wilbur C. Abbott, John S. Bassett, Charles W. Colby.

Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government: J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, John S. Bassett, Samuel F. Bemis, Worthington C. Ford, Andrew C. McLaughlin, John B. McMaster, Charles Moore, Frederick J. Turner.

Representatives in the International Committee of Historical Science: James T. Shotwell, 407 West 117th Street, New York; Waldo G. Leland, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

Committee on Preparing a Programme for Research and Publication: Dana C. Munro, Princeton University, Princeton, chairman; William K. Boyd, Wallace Notestein, A. M. Schlesinger, Bernadotte E. Schmitt, Charles Seymour.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FINMARK IN BRITISH DIPLOMACY, 1836–1855

BRITAIN'S efforts to thwart alleged Russian plans to get harbors in northern Norway belong to the less known chapters in the diplomatic history of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless to this question Lord Palmerston gave considerable attention. He was led to believe that Russia aimed at seizing Finmark, the northernmost county in Norway, to the north of Sweden, where a narrow strip of land separates Finland and Russia from the western ocean. In control of the splendid ice-free ports of this region, the great eastern rival might, it was feared, threaten the British supremacy on the sea. Palmerston, therefore, strove earnestly to check a possible Russian expansion to the west. Time and again he warned the Swedish-Norwegian foreign office, demanded and got definite promises that no land should be ceded to Russia; and he clinched the matter by a treaty of November 21, 1855. Britain and France herein undertook to protect the two Scandinavian states against Russia in return for pledges that no territory should be ceded to or exchanged with that power, nor should its subjects be given any special rights of pasturage, hunting, and fishing within the boundaries of the united kingdoms.

This treaty marked a change in the foreign policy of King Oscar I. Hitherto he had followed in his father's footsteps and sought to maintain close and friendly relations with the powerful eastern neighbor. Now he cast his lot with its enemies. To gain this end Napoleon III. had vainly exhausted his power of persuasion during the summer of 1854. And the breakdown of the negotiations for an alliance between the Western Powers and Sweden and Norway was partly due to Britain's lukewarmness towards this project. Therefore, when Palmerston in June, 1855, offered to guarantee the territorial integrity of these states without asking for any immediate and tangible compensation he mystified both Queen Victoria and Napoleon III. And historians unfamiliar with Palmerston's earlier interest in the Finmark question have thought that the treaty originated with the French emperor.

The documents at the Public Record Office show, however, that the British statesman in November, 1855, simply brought to an end his old quest for a barrier against Russian westward expansion. To this his attention was first drawn in 1836 by a report from the then British vice-consul in Hammerfest, John R. Crowe, and steps were

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taken to avert the danger. Shortly after Palmerston had become prime minister Crowe, who was now British consul general in Christiania, sent to the Foreign Office an account of the dispute between Russia and Norway in regard to the position of the Lapps on the international boundary. He charged that Russia kept this question open in order to gain Varangerfjord, and possibly other harbors in Norway, and reaffirmed his earlier claims that Britain here faced a serious danger.

After Palmerston had read this report he ordered the opening of negotiations at Stockholm and sketched the outline of a treaty to guarantee Norway against Russian encroachments, which guaranty was later extended so as to include Sweden. The treaty received an enthusiastic welcome from the leading English newspapers. They believed that by it Britain gained benefits in northwestern Europe similar to those secured by the Crimean War in the southeast corner of the Continent.

In order to appreciate Britain's attitude towards the Finmark question it must be called to mind that no one seems then to have known about the ice-free ports on the Murman coast,[1] and that Sweden and Norway at this time held a relatively stronger international position than they do at present. While the navies consisted chiefly of wooden, sailing vessels,[2] Scandinavia, with its large number of sailors, great supply of naval stores, and long coast line on the North Sea, might still be reckoned with as a formidable foe. For this reason Englishmen had protested against the union of the two kingdoms,[3] and the Russophile policy of Charles John[4] had caused much uneasiness. The British ministers in Stockholm always kept close watch over and at times took steps to counteract the intrigues of their Russian colleagues.[5]

[1] See a letter signed "A Norwegian", in the London *Times*, Nov. 9, and a leading article, Dec. 19, 1855.

[2] For the change from sail to steam, see Sir William L. Clowes, *The Royal Navy* (London, 1879–1903), VII. 1920.

[3] William Saunders to Lord Liverpool, May 3, 1814, Liverpool Papers, British Museum MSS.; C. W. Wynn in the House of Commons, May 12, 1814, Hansard, XXVII. 841; W. S. Smith in the House of Commons, July 30, 1814, *ibid.*, XXVIII. 878, 879.

[4] Charles XIV. John, the French Marshal Bernadotte, elected crown prince of Sweden 1810, king of Sweden and Norway 1818–1844.

[5] Lord Bloomfield to Lord Aberdeen, Jan. 5 and 22, 1830. J. A. D. Bloomfield to Lord Palmerston, Jan. 19, June 7, 1836. Public Record Office, F. O. Sweden, 73: 142, 164. Lord Howard de Walden was especially zealous in this respect. In a despatch to Palmerston of Apr. 19, 1833, he asked for full information in regard to his government's foreign policy in order to be better able to counteract the intrigues of Russia. He also expressed himself in very uncom-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At first Britain watched only Stockholm. The Russo-Norwegian boundary dispute remained unnoticed, and Lord Bloomfield reported briefly in 1826 that a boundary had been fixed "to the frozen ocean".[6] The change was caused indirectly by the Norwegian efforts, in the early 'thirties, to get the so-called "Affair at Bodö" taken up anew. This unsavory and for Britain very discreditable case belongs to the period 1818–1821. In the latter year the British government, by threats of placing an embargo upon Norwegian lumber, forced Norway to pay £18,000 to a band of English smugglers who had plied their trade at the town of Bodö and for this had suffered arrest and the confiscation of some of their wares.[7] With the unearthing of new evidence the Norwegians tried to recover the money paid under duress, but Palmerston refused to reopen the case.[8] It was, however, decided that vice-consul Crowe at Hammerfest had been compromised in such a way that he should be dismissed.[9] Informed of this, he hurried to London to defend himself. With his appeal pending, Crowe in June, 1836, wrote a long account of the economic and strategic importance of Finmark, emphasizing its potential value to Russia as an outlet to the western sea—a point which Palmerston, still smarting under the diplomatic defeat of Unkiar Skelessi, could not afford to overlook.

plimentary terms in regard to the character and ability of King Charles John. F. O. 73: 150. Sir Edward C. Disbrowe, in a despatch to Wellington, Jan. 10, 1835, states that he "was placed here with orders to watch and counteract the Russian Intrigues which . . . were both powerful and active". This despatch also shows that King Charles John tried to utilize the British fear of Russia in order to get the latter power to buy St. Bartholomew in the West Indies, then owned by Sweden. The king was in urgent need of money because of some unconstitutional expenditures which had to be covered up and it was claimed that Russia desired to buy the island. F. O. 73: 160. Britain did not buy, and St. Bartholomew was finally sold to France.

[6] Lord Bloomfield to Canning, May 19, 1826. See also despatch of Sept. 29, 1826, F. O. 73: 129.

[7] The complete story of this case, based upon material from archives and private papers, is found in Dr. Yngvar Nielsen's *Bodösagen fremstillet paa Grundlag af Officielle og Private Brevskaber* (Christiania, 1897). At the Public Record Office, in addition to the bundles marked "The Affair at Bodoe", a considerable amount of material is found among the Foreign Office papers relating to Sweden.

[8] Lord Howard de Walden was of the opinion that Lord Strangford, the British minister in Stockholm 1818–1821, had pursued a course "most unfortunate for the credit of the Government" and that a reopening of the case might prove embarrassing both to Britain and to the King of Sweden and Norway. Despatches to Palmerston, Apr. 19 and May 4 and 10, 1833, F. O. 73: 150. See also letters from Bulmer and Gillan to the Foreign Office Mar. 31 and Oct. 1, 1838, with memoranda, F. O. 73: 175; and Nielsen, *Bodösagen*, pp. 128, 129.

[9] F. O. 73: 150, 161, 167; Nielsen, *Bodösagen*, p. 128.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That Crowe knew about the Foreign Secretary's interest in furthering British commerce and keeping Russia in check must be considered more than probable. And it is just these topics which are emphasized in the above-mentioned report. Crowe gave a survey of the history of the Finmark trade, which, he asserted, dated back to the time of Alfred the Great and flourished in the days of Queen Elizabeth, but was later ruined by the short-sighted monopolistic policy of the Dano-Norwegian government. Since 1814 it had, however, revived and was now of growing importance for Great Britain. The British trade in this region was partly with the inhabitants and partly with Russian smugglers. The latter had become quite important for the British traders and manufacturers and, without bothering himself with the ethics of the case, Crowe held out hopes for its future development.[10] The Kaafjord Copper Mine, of which he was the managing director, was said to be very promising. About seven hundred men were employed and the mine was worked by British capital and managed by British subjects.[11] All in all, Crowe made out a good case for increased British interest in northern Norway.

Not contented with this, he proceeded to describe the excellent ice-free harbors found here. These were now used very extensively by the British ships engaged in the White Sea traffic, and for this reason, and also in order to check the growth of Russian influence in this part of the world, Crowe advised the appointment of a British consul at Hammerfest. Slowly but surely Russia was, in his opinion, strengthening her hold upon Finmark. Already she held almost a monopoly on its trade, and he believed that this province would ultimately share Finland's fate. The boundary was but twenty miles from the western ocean, and Torneå, now in Russian hands, was the key to Finmark. If Russia succeeded in getting Hammerfest she would have the long-wished-for outlet to the sea—an ice-free port, easily defended and from which she might menace the British commerce.[12]

Lord Palmerston read the report and sent copies of it to the Board of Trade and extracts to the Admiralty.[13] Crowe was ex-

[10] "The advantages at present reaped by our manufacturers and Ship Owners from this traffick are great, but would appear trifling when compared with what . . . they must become." Crowe to Palmerston, June 7, 1836, F. O. 73: 167.

[11] *Ibid.* For confirmation of this part of Crowe's report, see Amund Helland, *Finmarkens Amt* (Christiania, 1905), I. 721, 722.

[12] F. O. 73: 167.

[13] This was done by order from Lord Palmerston of June 8, 1836. *Ibid.*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

onerated,[14] got an indemnity of £500, and was made British consul at Hammerfest.[15] From now on he reported directly to the Foreign Office and never failed to reiterate his warnings of a Russian danger in the north. Nor were these unheeded.

Two factors tended to confirm and give an air of reality to the cry of wolf, which may have had but a slender basis in fact. These were the undoubtedly very close economic bonds between northern Norway and Russia and the failure on the part of the two countries to agree as to the reciprocal rights of the nomadic Lapps who roamed across the international boundary. Since the early part of the sixteenth century there had grown up a considerable exchange trade between the White Sea ports and Finmark. Every summer some hundreds of Russian vessels brought flour, grain, and lumber which they bartered for fish. Special commercial treaties favored this trade, which Russia stimulated and which remained important until brought to an end by the Bolshevik revolution in our own day. This economic penetration could be, and was, with some show of justice, pictured as a forerunner for political expansion.[16]

The problems presented by the Lapps were more complex, and it is possible that Russia had ulterior motives which made a settlement difficult. Briefly, they dealt with the treatment of an interesting nomadic people that from time immemorial has occupied the territory where the boundaries of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia meet. Simple and primitive, they little understood, or cared to understand, the fine points governing international relations and had no special fondness for any of their would-be masters. For perhaps thousands of years their needs and those of their reindeer herds have forced them to live in the interior during the winter and to seek the coast with the approach of the short arctic summer. Since the Middle Ages these migrations had complicated the relations between the adjoining states, at times giving causes or excuses for wars; and the Lapps were often taxed simultaneously by all the gov-

[14] Report of the king's advocate of Nov. 22, 1836, states that the previous opinion of Sept. 23, 1835, advising the dismissal of the vice-consul in Hammerfest, had been given in the belief that one Donovan, a forger and the chief culprit in the Bodö affair, held this post. The king's advocate did not believe Crowe to be implicated at all. *Ibid.* Professor Nielsen, on the other hand, after examining the private correspondence of some of the principals in the case, came to the conclusion that Crowe was engaged in smuggling along the coast of northern Norway in the years 1819–1820. Nielsen, *Bodösagen,* pp. 87, 88.

[15] F. O. 73: 167.

[16] A brief account of the history of this trade is given by Oscar A. Johnsen, *Finmarkens Politiske Historie* (Christiania, 1923), pp. 225–231. See also Helland, *Finmarkens Amt,* I. 777–780.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernments which claimed them as subjects. As between Norway and Sweden the boundary in the north and the rights of pasturage for the Lapps were practically settled by a treaty of October, 1751. But the Russo-Norwegian boundary treaty of 1826 effected only a temporary settlement of the question. Furthermore, since 1809 Finland had belonged to the Tsar's dominions and on the relatively long Norwegian-Finnish frontier the presence of the Lapps offered chances for complications. These arose from the need on the part of some of the Norwegian Lapps to seek pasturage for their herds in Russo-Finnish territory during the winter. Thus originated the questions which deeply influenced the Russo-Norwegian relations, especially in the years 1832–1855, caused Norway to fear Russian designs on her territory, supplied Crowe with material for his alarming reports, and caused Palmerston to keep a watchful eye on Finmark.[17]

After 1836 the British representatives in Stockholm, doubtless under orders from home, began to busy themselves with the Russo-Norwegian relations. F. D. Blight regretted that Norway, with a surplus in her treasury, neglected her defense. He too believed that the fjords in Finmark were Russia's natural gateway to the ocean, but one which British interests demanded should be closed to her.[18] The Russian trading privileges in Finmark seemed dangerous, and when efforts were made to gain similar rights in the adjoining districts of Tromsö and Senjen Britain objected. J. A. D. Bloomfield saw in this move a step towards political control. In vain did he try to arouse the Swedish government to an appreciation of the danger. They were, he complained, too much occupied with their own petty interests to see the broader aspects of the Finmark question. Only the crown prince, the later King Oscar I., seemed to grasp what might be at stake in the far north. Bloomfield did, however, find the Norwegians more watchful, and on December 8, 1837, he was able to report a satisfactory conversation on this topic with the Norwegian minister in Stockholm.[19]

Fearful lest the Scandinavians, relying upon British protection, should fail to make preparations for their own defense, Palmerston

[17] The best and most recent account of the problems presented by the migrations of the Lapps until 1826 is found in Johnsen, *Finmarkens Historie*; they in fact occupy the greater portion of that work. The report of a Norwegian royal commission of 1897 contains many valuable documents for a study of this question and brings the story down to the close of the nineteenth century. *Lappekommissionens Indstilling* (Christiania, 1904). A briefer survey is given by Helland, *Finmarkens Amt*, II. 693–761.

[18] Blight to Palmerston, Mar. 9, 1837, F. O. 73: 169.

[19] Bloomfield to Palmerston, Dec. 8, 1837, *ibid.*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on March 6, 1836, sent a characteristic homily to Stockholm. Bloomfield should tell the Swedes that the Russian encroachments in Finmark "are matters of direct interest to Sweden and only of remote interest to England; and that although England has been ready, in matters of such nature, to assist those who were willing to defend themselves, yet the English Nation would not easily be persuaded to make an effort to aid a people who were, by their apathy in time of danger, to show that they did not think their own liberty and independence worth fighting for".[20] However, despite this profession of relative indifference, Palmerston soon showed that he held the questions dealing with Finmark to be highly important to his own country.

Crowe proved tireless in sending warnings. In the annual report of December 31, 1837, he dwelt at great length on the difficulty of blockading the Norwegian coast. Should Russia once get a footing there she would be able to raid the seas and even the shores of Britain whenever she so desired. The overland communication between Russia and these ports was easy and could readily be made better, so that there would be no difficulty in the way of transporting large bodies of troops and war material. Points not settled by the Russo-Norwegian treaty of 1826 gave pretexts for new encroachments, and various signs showed that these would soon take place. The object seemed clear. Finmark, in addition to possessing many splendid harbors, had also rich fisheries which would serve as a nursery for seamen. "It is", he wrote, "a very general feeling here that sooner or later Finmark will share the fate of Finland."[21]

In despatches of 1838 and 1839 Crowe warned that the danger was close at hand. On the authority of a Russian military journal, he reported rumors of Russian overtures in Stockholm aiming at getting a Norwegian port and told of secret surveys made along the boundary which boded ill for the future.[22] Similar reports were also sent to the British minister in Stockholm so as to spur him on to greater vigilance.[23]

The warnings bore fruit. Sir Thomas Cartwright made inquiries at the Swedish-Norwegian foreign office regarding the alleged Russian activities in the north. But Baron Stjerneld[24] refused to attach any importance to these stories. They owed their

[20] F. O. 73: 172.

[21] F. O. 73: 171. A considerable portion of this despatch was sent to the Admiralty.

[22] Crowe to Palmerston, Sept. 4, 1838, Aug. 9, 1839, F. O. 73: 174, 179.

[23] Crowe to J. A. D. Bloomfield, Dec. 31, 1837, F. O. 73: 173.

[24] Baron Stjerneld served as minister for foreign affairs 1838–1842, 1848–1856.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

origin, he thought, to some preliminary work undertaken in order to replace a few boundary marks and ought not to alarm anybody.[25] However, Palmerston's fear was not calmed by these soothing words. On October 30, 1839, he wrote to Cartwright: "I have to instruct you to state to Baron Stierneld that Her Majesty's Government hope that Sweden is not about to make any fresh cession to Russia on the coast of Norway."[26] Stjerneld then gave positive assurance in regard to this and explained that the questions between Norway and Russia dealt simply with the erection of new boundary marks and the regulation of the rights of the Lapps in regard to pasturage across the boundary. For this purpose a mixed commission had been appointed and was now working at Åbo, in Finland.[27]

In December, 1837, Crowe offered to undertake a trip through the north of Russia to investigate the conditions and resources of these parts. Palmerston approved, and the instructions for the journey were issued March 20, 1838. Crowe was urged to be careful and "avoid giving to your journey the character of an official tour of inspection". The reports must also be sent through safe channels.[28] For various reasons the trip could not be undertaken till the late fall of 1839. Crowe then visited several places in Finland and in northern Russia, went by way of Stockholm to London, and the report on his journey is dated March 16, 1840. It was considered important enough to be printed for the confidential use of the Cabinet, and copies were sent to the Board of Trade and to the Admiralty.[29]

Crowe felt certain that Russia was slowly maturing her resources for a great war, in order to gain access to the Mediterranean and to the Atlantic. The latter sea would be reached by seizing Finmark. Only thereby could she achieve her ambition to become a great maritime power. Here were found "ports capable of containing all the navies of the World, and . . . a sufficient number of sailors to man the largest Fleets; and that she has such a plan in view those who have watched her quiet but steady and consistent progress, assisted by the unpardonable apathy and total ignorance of the Swedish government in matters referring to the Province, cannot but conclude, and in fact it is the general impression in the province itself that such will be its fate, unless paralysed by England".

Russia had, he thought, fixed her eyes on some of the Norwegian fjords. When she took Finland she came within twenty miles of the

[25] Cartwright to Palmerston, Oct. 1, 1839, F. O. 73: 177.
[26] *Ibid.*
[27] Cartwright to Palmerston, Dec. 5, 1839, *ibid.*
[28] F. O. 73: 174.
[29] F. O. 73: 184.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sea; in settling the boundary question with Norway she had succeeded in pushing westward along the shores of the Arctic Ocean; and this question might be opened anew as a result of the dispute over the pasturage rights of the Lapps. By her following an enlightened and purposeful policy more than 10,000 trained seamen were now found in northern Russia; 500 to 600 vessels were engaged in the Finmark trade; and a war-ship of seventy-four guns was now being built at Archangel. Here he had also seen transports, large magazines, and stores with war material. Torneå would soon be connected with the rest of Russia by means of a splendid highway, and from there it could easily be extended to the sea. A body of Russian engineers had, during the previous summer, busied themselves with mysterious surveys along the frontier, and the energy and vigor shown by Russia contrasted sharply with the negligence of the Swedish government in regard to this matter. The recent commercial treaty made northern Norway even more dependent upon Russia than was formerly the case; and, although Crowe found some consolation in the thought that the Russian seamen could never equal the British, he believed Britain should be on the alert and stop Russia's "insidious advances".[30]

When passing through Stockholm, on his way to London, Crowe told Cartwright what he had seen and that Russia tried to get a piece of land at the Varangerfjord. This news the minister took to Baron Stjerneld and repeated his earlier statement that Britain "could never approve of any cession of territory to Russia, on the Northern Coast of Norway". To this the Swedish-Norwegian foreign minister replied that the subject had not been lost sight of and that he would get into touch with the commissioners at Åbo. Later he was, however, able to state positively that Russia had not suggested any cession of territory.[31]

Palmerston approved of the steps Cartwright had taken, and to emphasize this question still further he instructed the minister "to state distinctly and officially to Baron Stierneld, that this is a matter to which the British Government attaches extreme importance, and that Great Britain could not view with indifference any cession whatever of territory in that quarter by Sweden to Russia".[32] To this Stjerneld replied that no danger existed. Nothing resembling a demand for territory had been broached by the Russian commissioners at Åbo. The discussion there dealt only with the renewal of the old boundary marks and with the fees to be paid by the Lapps for pastur-

[30] F. O. 73: 184.

[31] Cartwright to Palmerston, Mar. 6, 1840, F. O. 73: 182.

[32] Palmerston to Cartwright, Mar. 23, 1840, F. O. 73: 181.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

age rights in the country of which they were not subjects. It had, however, proved difficult to arrive at any settlement. The commission was now about to move to St. Petersburg, where its work could be supervised by the Swedish-Norwegian minister, Count Palmstierna.[33] But this alarmed Palmerston. On May 15, 1840, he asked Cartwright "to point out to the Swedish minister that there is no more convenient mode of obtaining an acquisition of territory than the appointment of commissioners to substitute new land marks for old, or to erect new land marks in the room of others supposed to be lost altogether; and that the establishment of a mixed commission of Swedes and Russians for that purpose at *St. Petersburg,* would seem to be a proceeding which the Swedish Government would do well to watch with some attention".[34]

In his answer Stjerneld took pains to explain that the boundary marks had only been wide alleys cut through the forests and later closed with the growth of new trees. When these were renewed care would be taken so that Russia should gain nothing thereby. The removal of the commission to St. Petersburg had been suggested by the Norwegians in the hope of finding there a person powerful enough to break the deadlock in regard to the pasturage fees. When Cartwright mentioned the desirability of choosing another city, Stjerneld promised to see if a change could be brought about and repeated his former statement that nothing "resembling a proposition for a cession of the northern coast of Norway or elsewhere" had been made at these negotiations. He said, further, that as long as he was "at the head of affairs Her Majesty's Government might be satisfied that if any such proposition were ever made, it should be instantly rejected".[35]

This satisfied Palmerston for the time being. But new disclosures soon reawakened his old fear, strengthened the confidence in Crowe's reports, and led to official demands that the Swedish-Norwegian king and his Foreign Secretary should give definite pledges never to cede any portion of Finmark to Russia. The cause of this was the information got by Cartwright, probably in January, 1841, that King Charles John had, during the preceding September, tried to effect an exchange with Russia whereby this power should cede the strip of territory which separates Finmark from the Swedish Lappmark in return for some land which the Swedish government owned in Constantinople and which Russia earlier had attempted to

[33] Cartwright to Palmerston, Apr. 30, 1840, F. O. 73: 182.

[34] F. O. 73: 181. For the negotiations at Åbo and St. Petersburg, see *Lappekommissionens Indstilling,* pp. 50–52.

[35] Cartwright to Palmerston, June 5, 1840, F. O. 73: 182.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

buy in order to build her embassy thereon. To this the Russian government replied that they no longer needed the land in Constantinople, but that an exchange might be effected between the territory mentioned and a district bordering on the Varangerfjord. According to the Russian minister in Stockholm, Count Matuszewicz, who told this to Cartwright, Charles John was willing to arrange for the exchange, but the plan broke down because the Norwegians and the Swedes could not agree as to who should get the territory gained from Finland.[36]

Cartwright did not let his Russian colleague know that Britain attached much importance to this question. Having gathered all the information available as to the proposed exchange he went to the Foreign Secretary, A. E. Ihre,[37] and asked for an explanation. Ihre denied that the Swedish government contemplated taking such a step and stated, furthermore, that the constitutions of the two kingdoms forbade a cession of land without the consent of the parliament of the country concerned. But Cartwright's suspicion had been aroused, and he insisted that he knew that negotiations looking towards an exchange of territory had taken place and voiced his fear lest the Storthing or the Riksdag might give its consent. "I told him", wrote Cartwright to Palmerston, "that my object was therefore to impress upon him the necessity of putting a stop at once to any such project. I said that the cession of any territory to Russia on the northern coast of Norway might be very injurious to the interests of Great Britain, and could not be tacitly acquiesced in by Her." Cartwright also warned Ihre that such an act might disturb the good relations between Britain and Russia which it was in the Swedish interests to see preserved as long as possible.

Ihre then gave "the most positive assurances that the arrangement desired by Russia would not take place", and further explained how this question had arisen. Russia had not taken the initiative. When Charles John got her counter-proposition it was

[36] Cartwright to Palmerston, Feb. 5, 1841, no. 7, "Secret". In concluding this despatch Cartwright wrote: "It has thus transpired that the information furnished by Mr. Consul Crowe, representing the Russian Government to have an eye to the acquisition of this territory in Norway for the purpose of forming a naval establishment there, has been throughout correct. The first attempt to attain their end has been unsuccessful and some time will probably now elapse before another attempt is made, but it is not likely that the idea of obtaining possession of this territory will be given up altogether, as the spot offers great advantages for the site of a town. Your Lordship will not fail to observe with what tact the Russian Government made the King's first proposition available to their own projects." F. O. 73: 186.

[37] Baron A. E. Ihre served temporarily as minister for foreign affairs while Stjerneld had leave of absence.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at once rejected, and all ideas of effecting any exchange had now been given up.[38]

Palmerston, upon receiving this information, instructed Cartwright to say to King Charles John and to Ihre, "that Her Majesty's Government understand the Swedish Government to have distinctly and positively pledged itself to that of Great Britain that no part of the Norwegian Territory shall be ceded to Russia".[39] To this Cartwright replied: "M. d' Ihre has declared to me that he was expressly authorized by the King, to give the formal assurance to the British Government, that H. M. had no intention whatever to propose, either now, or at any future period, a cession of any part of the Norwegian territory to Russia, or accede to any proposition for such cession."[40]

With this Palmerston was satisfied, and for a decade Britain paid no attention to Finmark. Crowe tried vainly to interest Lord Aberdeen in this question,[41] and when he himself was moved to Christiania in 1843[42] other topics engaged his attention. Russia and Norway failed, however, to agree on the pasturage question. The former refused to be bound by the treaty of 1751 and brought up the subject of the right of her own Lapps to hunt and fish in Norwegian territory. In June, 1851, she demanded that a tract of land by the Varangerfjord should be set aside for their use. Here they might build houses and sheds for their boats and nets and stay during the winter.[43] Negotiations were now carried on in Stockholm, but it was from the British representatives in St. Petersburg that Palmerston, who had returned to the Foreign Office, got his information about the Russian claims.

Sir Andrew Buchanan, then British chargé d'affaires in St. Petersburg, summarized these in a despatch of August 19, 1851, and added: "It is natural to suppose that the Russian Government may eventually hope to extend such a fishing station into a naval station from which their ships of war may at all times have access to the ocean."[44] Palmerston sent a copy of the despatch to Sir Edmund

[38] Cartwright to Palmerston, Feb. 5, 1841, no. 8, F. O. 73: 186.

[39] Palmerston to Cartwright, Mar. 1, 1841, *ibid.*

[40] Cartwright to Palmerston, Apr. 16, 1841, *ibid.*

[41] In his annual reports for 1840 and 1841. F. O. 73: 184, 188.

[42] Appointed consul general July 8, 1843. F. O. 73: 194, 196.

[43] *Lappekommissionens Indstilling*, pp. 53–55.

[44] F. O. Russia, 65: 394. Palmerston, writing to Sir Hamilton Seymour, the British ambassador in St. Petersburg, Nov. 13, 1851, said that it had long been known that Russia desired a port in northern Norway. "But it would be very undesirable for the interests of England that Russia should have a naval station commanding the northern coast of this Island where we have no naval station, such station being moreover open all the year round." F. O. 65: 390.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lyons, the British minister at Stockholm, and wrote: "I have to instruct you strongly to dissuade the Swedish Government from making to Russia any cession of Territory in that quarter. Such cession would only serve as a foundation for further encroachments, and afford a basis of a naval station commanding the coast of Norway."[45] Stjerneld promised that the Russian demands would be refused.[46] During the fall of 1851, while the Russian and the Norwegian representatives wrestled with the problems presented by the Lapps, Palmerston kept in close touch with the negotiations and supported the Norwegians, who also feared the designs of Russia and rejected her propositions, with the result that she closed her frontiers to the Norwegian Lapps.[47] Norway retaliated and the Lapps, having become pawns in the great game of international politics, paid the penalty for the fear aroused by Russia's actions.[48]

In December, 1851, Palmerston was dismissed from the Foreign Office. Again Britain seemed to lose interest in the Finmark question. It did not come up till he had become prime minister and Consul General Crowe in the spring of 1855 had written another of his long dissertations on the Russian menace in the north. When as a result of this Palmerston caused steps to be taken towards a definite guaranty of Norway's territorial integrity, Britain seemed to be reversing the policy, in regard to Scandinavia, followed while Napoleon III. tried to enlist her aid in the war against Russia. A brief survey of these efforts and of the British attitude towards them will throw into greater relief Palmerston's connection with the November treaty, and at the same time shed new light upon the allied diplomacy at the time of the Crimean War.

When the crisis drew near in the Russo-Turkish relations, Lord Clarendon tried to bring Sweden over to the side of the allies. In a despatch of August 25, 1853, Sir Edmund Lyons was asked to call the attention of the Swedish government to the Russian danger. He hoped that Sweden would seek an alliance with Britain: "The char-

[45] Sept. 5, 1851, F. O. 73: 244. Since Sweden and Norway had the minister for foreign affairs and diplomatic service in common, Palmerston committed the then usual error of speaking only of the Swedish government, when of course any cession of territory in Finmark could be made only by Norway.

[46] Lyons to Palmerston, Sept. 23, 1851, F. O. 73: 246.

[47] "Your Lordship's Despatches, founded upon the valuable information of Her Majesty's Mission at St. Petersburg, have had a very salutary effect." Lyons to Palmerston, Nov. 28, 1851. See also Palmerston to Lyons, Nov. 11 and Dec. 2 and 11, 1851, *ibid.*; Buchanan to Palmerston, Sept. 2, and Seymour to Palmerston, Nov. 19, 1851, F. O. 65: 394 and F. O. 182: 15.

[48] *Lappekommissionens Indstilling*, pp. 55 ff.; Helland, *Finmarkens Amt*, II. 129–137; A. C. Manthey, *Dagbøger* (Christiania, 1909–1919), I. 111, 112.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acter and habits and mutual interests of the two countries render this alliance both natural and desirable, and I need not assure you that the earnest wish of Her Majesty's Government is to promote it by every means in their power." [49]

But this wish found no expression in action. Apart from Sir Charles Napier's half-hearted overture, Britain made no serious effort, nor did she second that of her ally, to enlist the aid of Sweden. The British representatives at Stockholm strove to increase Sweden's fear of Russia and intrigued with the war party, but remained spectators during the Franco-Swedish negotiations of 1854. In vain did William Grey, the British chargé d'affaires, ask his government for permission to lend the French a helping hand.[50] Lord Aberdeen refused to move. However, the French minister at Stockholm, M. Lobstein, kept his British colleagues well informed of all the steps taken by him and by his government, and the despatches from Grey and Arthur C. Magenis give the full story of Napoleon III.'s attempt to conclude an alliance with Sweden.

Public opinion in Norway seems to have been on the side of the Western Powers from the beginning of the war.[51] But Sweden controlled the foreign policy of the united kingdoms. Here, too, the pro-ally sentiment was very strong. The Russians were old enemies and a strong war party existed in the highest circles. The Queen of Sweden and Napoleon III. were cousins, and the crown prince, the later King Charles XV., was a romantic youth who hoped to emulate both his grandfather, Bernadotte, and his namesake, the twelfth Charles. Besides, a war with Russia might strengthen the dynasty.[52] But many factors checked this warlike spirit of the nation and of its rulers. Foremost among these were fear of Russia and unwillingness to break off the friendly relations which had existed since 1812; [53] the cautious temperament of King Oscar I., combined with his distrust of Napoleon III.; and especially weighty was

[49] F. O. 73: 254.

[50] William Grey, British chargé d'affaires in Stockholm, seems to have been a close friend of the crown prince, who at times spoke too freely about his father's views and even appears to have given out confidential information.

[51] Consul General Crowe reported, Nov. 13, 1854, that he had at times had to discourage the demonstrations showing sympathy for the Western Powers lest the Norwegian government might become embarrassed. F. O. 73: 264.

[52] Charles John showed at times considerable fear that the Swedish people might turn to the son of the deposed Gustaf IV. Adolf (Niels Bache, *Nordens Historie*, Copenhagen, 1887, V. 296–298), and Bloomfield stated in a despatch to Palmerston of Apr. 27, 1832, that Charles John did not dare to break away from Russia lest that power might support the claims of Prince Vasa. F. O. 356: 37.

[53] N. N. Cronholm, *A History of Sweden* (New York, 1902), II. 280, 281; J. E. Sars, *Samlede Værker* (Christiania, 1912), III. 656.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the determination on the part of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Baron Stjerneld, to keep Sweden and Norway neutral in the war. The events of 1813–1814 had taught this veteran statesman to put little trust in princes and in treaties.[54]

The conversations aiming at establishing an alliance between Sweden and the Western Powers began when Lobstein, on April 5, 1854, presented a note wherein Drouyn de Lhuys expressed the hope that Sweden would now seize the opportunity to recover former glory and regain lost provinces.[55] In his reply Oscar I. then, as well as on later occasions, spoke of the strength of his army and navy and let fall hints that he might enter the war if the allies would grant liberal subsidies and certain, not clearly defined, guaranties,[56] and if Austria could be induced to join the alliance.[57] These questions were discussed at an audience which Lobstein had with the king, May 29,[58] and negotiations began in earnest when, in the following month, Major Blanchard, of the French general staff, and Captain Karth, of the engineers, arrived in Sweden.[59] But Oscar I. proved wary. When the French tried to induce him to declare war against Russia, using the argument that his demand in regard to Austria had been met by verbal promises from the Austrian emperor, the king asked to have these presented to him in writing.[60] He would not enter upon an adventure "à la Charles Douze". With the approach of the winter the Swedish demands stiffened, especially after Stjerneld's return to Stockholm from a two months' holiday. Oscar I. now complained that the allies failed to appreciate the Russian danger in the north and asked why Britain remained silent.[61] The hesitation of Austria, coupled with Britain's lack of enthusiasm for the projected alliance, were indeed the chief factors which kept Sweden and Norway neutral during the Crimean War.

Although Clarendon did not take part in the Franco-Swedish negotiations, he appears to have realized the need for Scandinavian

[54] Grey to Clarendon, Apr. 13, "Secret and Confidential", and Magenis to Clarendon, Nov. 7, 1854. F. O. 73: 261, 263. Arthur C. Magenis was appointed British minister in Stockholm, July 12, 1854.

[55] Grey to Clarendon, Apr. 6 and 8, 1854. Grey gives the crown prince and M. Lobstein as sources. F. O. 73: 261.

[56] Grey to Clarendon, July 24 and 26; Magenis to Clarendon, Aug. 14, 1854. F. O. 73: 262, 263. See also Carl Hallendorff, *Oscar I., Napoleon, och Nikolaus* (Stockholm, 1918), pp. 44–50.

[57] Grey to Clarendon, June 6 and July 24, 1854, F. O. 73: 262; Albin Cullberg, *La Politique du Roi Oscar I. pendant la Guerre de Crimée* (Stockholm, 1912), I. 77–84; Hallendorff, *op. cit.*, pp. 44–50.

[58] Grey to Clarendon, June 6, 1854, F. O. 73: 262.

[59] Grey to Clarendon, June 14, 19, 22, and 26 and July 12, 1854, *ibid.*

[60] Grey to Clarendon, July 24 and 26, 1854, *ibid.*; Hallendorff, p. 48.

[61] Magenis to Clarendon, Aug. 14 and 30, 1854, F. O. 73: 263.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

friendship and would have welcomed their aid, if this could have been had without any cost to Britain. He allowed Finmark to trade with Russia, despite the blockade,[62] and Sir Charles Napier was instructed to show the greatest care so as not to offend the Scandinavians.[63] Hopes were entertained that they might volunteer for service in the Baltic fleet and thereby put it into fighting trim. But this they did not do.[64] Napier saw clearly that without Swedish aid nothing could be done;[65] and, acting under orders from home, he broached the question of an alliance at his audience with Oscar I., April 26, 1854. When the king said that he could not abandon his neutrality without definite promises of guaranties and of subsidies, Napier replied that he lacked authority to discuss these topics[66] and did not pursue the matter any further.

Sir James Graham, then first lord of the Admiralty, believed that the Åland Islands would prove a sufficient bait for Sweden, and for this reason he ordered Napier to postpone his attack upon Bomarsund. A delay might whet Sweden's appetite for the islands.[67] However, Graham realized later that this was a mistake and urged their seizure by the allies because then "we shall be enabled to command her future assistance at our own terms".[68] A vain hope—Sweden refused to accept the islands when they were offered to her.[69]

[62] Grey to Clarendon, Mar. 11, and Clarendon to Grey, Apr. 5, 1854, F. O. 73: 259.

[63] "You will take care to respect strictly the neutrality of Sweden and Denmark and to use your utmost endeavor to maintain the most friendly relations with the Governments of those countries—enjoining the Ships under your orders to be careful not to give any cause of offense." Admiralty to Sir Charles Napier, Mar. 8, 1854, Public Record Office, Napier Papers, vol. I., ff. 4, 5.

[64] Sir James Graham to Napier, Mar. 12, 1854, Noel Williams, *Life of Sir Charles Napier* (London, 1918), pp. 265, 307; Napier Papers, vol. XII.; Grey to Clarendon, Apr. 17, 1854, F. O. 73: 261.

[65] "It is a pity Sweden does not decide to join the Western powers . . . with her army and gunboats we might go to Sweaborg." Napier to Count A. E. Rosen, June 4, 1854, Napier Papers, vol. XII., f. 302.

[66] Napier to Clarendon, Apr. 26, 1854, *ibid.*, f. 170.

[67] "Sweden is well disposed but wants subsidies and guarantees which we cannot give her. At last her own Interest will compel her to join us on easier terms—but this is a reason why you should be in *no hurry* about Bomarsund, which will always be open to your attack, if you can prevent the passage of Troops from Åbo to the Åland Islands. The hope of regaining the possession of these Islands is the strongest possible inducement to Sweden to embark in the Confederacy, and if Sweden lead the way Denmark will follow." Graham to Napier, May 1, 1854, *ibid.*, ff. 137, 138; Williams, *Life of Napier*, p. 288.

[68] Graham to Napier, July 2, 1854, "Private", Napier Papers, vol. XIII., f. 33.

[69] Hallendorff, pp. 51, 52. In regard to the proposed Swedish occupation of the Åland Islands Napier wrote to Lord Bloomfield at Berlin, Aug. 29, 1854: "Sweden would not garrison Bomarsund and I think she ought not to have had

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Napier had not shared the illusions of his chief in regard to the value of the Åland Islands,[70] but he continued to emphasize the need for Swedish aid. Grey tried to convince the Foreign Office that this might be had by applying a little pressure in Stockholm[71] and expressed fear lest they injured the cause of the allies by refusing to pay Sweden subsidies.[72] The French also lamented the failure of Britain to appreciate the full value of a Scandinavian alliance. All in vain—Britain could not be moved.

Lord Cowley, the British ambassador in Paris, and Lord Clarendon told Drouyn de Lhuys that it was futile to negotiate with Sweden while she made Austria's accession to the alliance a *sine qua non*,[73] and Graham wrote to Napier, May 1, 1854, that the Swedish demands for guaranties and subsidies could not be accepted.[74] This was also the tenor of a statement made by Lord Clarendon to Admiral Virgin, the Swedish-Norwegian minister in London, in the fall of the same year.[75] Lord Aberdeen expressed frankly his distrust of a prospective ally that demanded subsidies. If these were to be paid, he held it would be better to pay them to Austria than to Sweden. He refused to shoulder any new responsibilities in the north.[76] It is, therefore, not surprising that Queen Victoria in 1855 asked for a full explanation as to why her ministers now offered to guarantee the territorial integrity of Scandinavia "without the counterbalancing advantage of Sweden giving us her assistance in the war".[77]

The solution of the mystery is found in the reopening of the Finmark question after Palmerston had come to the helm and when the

it as she neither could finish the works or garrison them." Napier Papers, vol. XIII., f. 315.

70 "I have no hopes of Sweden—even if we take the Islands she will not move." Napier to Bloomfield, July 25, 1854, *ibid.*, f. 117.

71 "I should conceal the truth from your Lordship if I were not to state my firm conviction that in order to obtain the coöperation of Sweden it will be necessary *to press* her, and that the King will be grateful for the application of that pressure." Grey to Clarendon, June 6, 1854, F. O. 73: 262.

72 Grey to Clarendon, June 22, 1854, *ibid.*

73 Cowley to Clarendon, no. 800, June 26, no. 856, July 7, and Clarendon to Cowley, no. 643, June 28, 1854. F. O. France, 27: 1000, 1017, 1018. Lord Clarendon never had any real hope that Oscar I. would join the allies. Writing to Napier, July 4, 1854, he said that the King of Sweden and Norway must look ahead "and unless he can make himself safe for *the future* he will take no active part until Austria is in the field". Napier Papers, vol. XII., ff. 172, 173.

74 See note 67.

75 Clarendon to Magenis, Oct. 28, 1854, F. O. 73: 259.

76 Lady Frances Balfour, *The Life of George, Fourth Earl of Aberdeen* (London, 1922), II. 216.

77 *The Letters of Queen Victoria*, ed. A. C. Benson and Viscount Esher (London, 1907), III. 169, 170.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conditions seemed favorable for putting a check upon the suspected Russian advance towards the northwest. This check was the November treaty. The danger which might threaten in this quarter had, indeed, been brought up for discussion while the allies and Sweden were jockeying for position in the early stages of the previous negotiations. The Swedish crown prince mentioned it to Grey, February 21, 1854,[78] and on the eleventh of March Baron de Geer, interim Swedish-Norwegian minister in London, brought it to Clarendon's attention. De Geer gave a summary of the existing status of the question and said that Russia no doubt had in mind getting an ice-free harbor at the Varangerfjord. Clarendon made inquiries at the Admiralty, which replied, April 24: "My Lords are of opinion that it is most important to uphold in the strongest manner any protest which Sweden may make against the appropriation of Waranga Bay by Russia."[79] With this they dropped the question.

The Norwegians meanwhile became more and more alarmed at the situation in Finmark. By the closing of the frontiers the Lapps suffered considerable losses, and the Russian government absolutely refused to modify its decree to the extent of permitting the passage of Norwegian Lapps through their territory to Sweden. The questions which arose in this connection were debated in secret meetings of the Storthing in July, 1854,[80] and it was believed that Russia was trying to compel Norway to grant concessions, possibly in the form of giving up land at the Varangerfjord. This state of affairs caused Consul General Crowe to resume writing on his old topic. He gave a summary of the Russo-Norwegian dispute regarding the rights of the Lapps in a despatch to Clarendon dated October 13, 1854. Russia desired an ice-free harbor, which demand the Norwegians had hitherto stoutly refused.[81] But this did not make any impression upon Lord Aberdeen. When he had resigned and Palmerston took his place, the change was almost instantaneous.

On May 31, 1855, Lord Clarendon received a despatch from Crowe, together with a long report on the Russo-Norwegian boundary question. In the former he stated that he now had full information

[78] Grey to Clarendon, Feb. 23, 1854, F. O. 73: 260.

[79] F. O. 73: 266, 267.

[80] The "Constitutional Committee" recommended, in a report of July 19, that the Storthing request the government to make an appeal to the powers in regard to the closing of the Russo-Norwegian frontier. But the Storthing decided against this. *Kongeriget Norges Fjortende Ordentlige Storthings Forhandlinger*, part II., pp. 67, 69, 71. Only the journal of the secret meetings of the Storthing, July 20, 22, and 29, 1854, was available for public use when the writer visited Christiania in the summer of 1923.

[81] F. O. 73: 264.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about the matters which caused the Storthing to hold meetings behind closed doors in the preceding July. The Norwegians then held the situation in the north to be so serious that they had considered making an appeal to the powers—a step which would have been taken but for the war. Crowe felt sure that Russia intended to take a portion of Finmark at the earliest opportunity. Altenfjord, west of the North Cape, was most likely to be the objective. In this she would probably succeed, because the county of Finmark had little value for Norway and the inhabitants did not seem averse to changing their allegiance, "on the contrary, the majority believe their material welfare would be greatly improved and consequently would not object to the transfer; but its loss or conversion into Russian property would strike at the corner-stone of the independence of Norway, and in time perhaps would bring a second Cronstadt or Helsingfors within the vicinity of our own shores". The attention of Lord Palmerston had formerly been called to this topic, "and I have reason to believe the importance of the subject did not escape his Lordship's notice".[82]

In the long enclosure Crowe tried to show how, since the Middle Ages, Russia had moved steadily westward, using political, economic, and religious factors to serve her ends. The old boundaries which Crowe claimed for Norway had indeed never existed, but this the British government did not know. The existing frontier was only twenty miles from excellent harbors in Lyngenfjord. A comparison of the older boundaries with the present might well arouse fears for the future. Crowe again told his government that "the contiguity of Finmark to Great Britain, her great extent of coast, excellent harbors and maritime population, attaches a value to the possession of the rugged and poor province it otherwise would not have". And he concluded by saying that the territorial integrity and the independence of Norway ought to be jealously guarded.[83]

The warning was heeded. The despatch, with enclosure, was sent to Lord Palmerston and both were printed for the confidential use of the Cabinet. Under the date June 3, is found the following note in Palmerston's hand and signed with his characteristic "P": "It might be well to enter into some agreement with the King of Sweden and Norway binding him to make no concession whatever

[82] The despatch is dated May 23, 1855. F. O. 73: 272.

[83] This report bears the date May 1, 1855. *Ibid.* On July 17, 1855, Crowe forwarded a map which purported to show the eastern boundaries of Finmark from the Middle Ages till the settlement of 1826. Inasmuch as no boundary had been fixed until 1751, the very generous ones presented by Crowe were apparently based on no better authority than that of a history of Norway by Gerhard Schöning (Sorø, 1771), I. 68, 69.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Russia whether of Fishery Rights, Pasture Rights or Territory without the consent of Great Britain. Such a treaty would be a security to us and a definitive support to him." [84] This contains the essence of the November treaty.

The British government now acted swiftly. On June 4 Clarendon had ready the draft of a despatch to Arthur C. Magenis, British minister in Stockholm, ordering him to sound the king and the Minister of Foreign Affairs in regard to a treaty guaranteeing the integrity of Norway. The despatch was first sent to Lord Cowley to gain France's approval of the step proposed. This he got without any difficulty,[85] and on June 28 the despatch was sent to Magenis. Clarendon herein voiced his fear that Russia intended to take a part of northern Norway and there build another Bomarsund from which she might threaten the independence of Scandinavia. Britain would aid the King of Sweden and Norway in resisting any such attempt provided he made no concessions to Russia in regard to the rights of fishing and pasturage, nor ceded any territory to her. Clarendon furthermore asked Magenis to explain to the king that the moment was now favorable to gain this safeguard for his dominions. With the war over, Russia would no doubt renew her efforts to get harbors in Finmark, and it might then be difficult for Britain, without any such treaty, to come to the aid of Sweden and Norway.[86]

When Magenis and his French colleague broached this subject to Oscar I. and Baron Stjerneld, the latter showed at first little enthusiasm, but soon both gave it their approval, " in principle ". The only change they wished to make was, that Sweden ought to be included in the proposed guaranty. The king said that the treaty meant a new orientation in his foreign policy, which might expose Sweden to the wrath of Russia. In his attempts to get appropriations for defense the Swedes had always proved more willing to make sacrifices than had the Norwegians, " and a feeling of jealousy might be created in this country by the defensive treaty not being extended to it ". When Stjerneld intimated that there might be constitutional difficulties in the way of having the treaty apply only to Norway, he was sharply reminded by Magenis of the fact that, although a Swede, he was in duty bound to serve the interests of Norway too. Magenis saw, however, no real objection to granting this demand.[87]

[84] F. O. 73: 269. This, together with the subsequent negotiations, proves that Lord Palmerston, not Napoleon III. as surmised by Hallendorff (p. 93), was the originator of the November treaty.

[85] F. O. 27: 1054, 1070.

[86] F. O. 73: 269.

[87] Magenis to Clarendon, July 11, 14, 16, and 17, 1855, F. O. 73: 270.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By the middle of July the first steps had been taken towards the conclusion of the November treaty, but the negotiations did not begin in earnest until three months later. The reasons for the delay must be sought partly in Queen Victoria's insistence upon full and complete explanations of the needs for and the benefits to be had from the proposed treaty, and more especially in the attitude of the French. They approved Clarendon's draft of the treaty "in principle", but Count Walewski delayed placing it before the emperor. Finally he told Cowley, September 23, that the emperor was "averse to signing any treaty with Sweden which was not *offensive* as well as *defensive*". He clearly did not want to give up the old idea of an alliance. On the same day Lord Cowley had an audience with the emperor at St. Cloud. At this he said that he could not understand why they should give a guaranty without any corresponding advantage in return, such as active aid in the present war. By such a treaty France and Britain tied their hands and might be forced to go to war because of a policy over which they had no control.[88]

Cowley's reply to these objections was based largely upon the information given by Crowe. He said that proofs existed of Russian designs on Finmark "where the sea was always open in the most inclement winter, and where one of those gigantic naval establishments which Russia so well understands to create, might be easily formed, that such an establishment would be a continued menace to the coasts of France and England, and that it could not therefore be said that a treaty which bound Sweden never to cede territory to Russia did not contain an engagement of immediate value to England and France". The treaty would serve as an insurance against such an event. Russia would hardly attack Sweden and Norway, when she knew that Britain and France were to come to their aid.

Napoleon III. then said "that he did not entertain a hope of engaging Sweden in active hostilities against Russia, but that he thought the king might be asked to adhere to the treaty signed between the maritime powers and Austria, and so far abandon his neutrality as to open all Swedish ports to the allied fleets and give other assistance short of taking the field".[89] However, the British view prevailed.

[88] Cowley to Clarendon, Sept. 24, 1855, F. O. 27: 1076.

[89] *Ibid.* The concluding paragraph of this despatch reveals how slender was the thread which held Britain and France together during the Crimean War. Cowley wrote: "The Emperor's principal apprehension appears to be that France may find herself entangled hereafter, perhaps even at an early date, in a war with Russia, in virtue of a Treaty, which gives her no adequate advantages, and that the French nation would resent such policy—H. M. is perhaps hardly willing to admit that which I suspect to be the truth, that a people who have so little confidence in their govt. as the French, a people who have always looked

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The allies undertook to guarantee the territorial integrity of Sweden and Norway without any immediate compensation.

This point was emphasized in Clarendon's despatch to Magenis of October 18, 1855, which summarized the reasons why the treaty was deemed necessary. It left the present situation untouched and did "not constitute a state of hostility on the part of Sweden against Russia, and it will not therefore compel us to allot military forces to aid in her defense against her neighbor".[90] The last sentence indicates pretty clearly that even Palmerston's government had no desire to bring about the scattering of Britain's military forces which an alliance with the Scandinavian states might make necessary.

Clarendon claimed that the treaty marked the achievement in part of the main object of the war, namely, to curb the power of Russia. It safeguarded Sweden and Norway and at the same time, by forbidding the exchange of territory without the consent of the allies, it removed the danger that Sweden might exchange Varangerfjord for Åland, which would doubtless benefit her, but gravely injure Britain. In concluding the despatch Clarendon gave his views as regards the general European aspects of the treaty. It should be looked upon "as part of a long line of circumvallation to confine the future extension of Russia, even if by the events of war her outposts should not be driven in at any part of her present circumference . . . and . . . by endeavouring effectually to confine her on all sides we shall take the best means of avoiding future collisions".[91]

The negotiations for the conclusion of the treaty reached their final stage with the arrival, October 28, of Clarendon's draft. Everything now went smoothly and rapidly. A few verbal changes were agreed upon and it was signed November 21, 1855.[92] The character and contents of the treaty have been sketched already. By it the King of Sweden and Norway pledged himself not to cede to or exchange with or permit Russia to use any territory belonging to the united kingdoms, nor to grant to that power any pasturage, fishing, or other rights, but to resist all such pretensions. In the event of Russia making any demands upon him they should immediately be communicated to Britain and France, who undertook to furnish

rather to present expediency than to future results, who profit by no lesson, and who, whatever may be said to the contrary, still retain that jealousy of England which has been their bane as well as ours, may view the signature to and publication of such a treaty as that now under consideration, as a useless provocation to future war, and a fresh sacrifice made to British interests."

[90] F. O. 73: 269.

[91] *Ibid.*

[92] F. O. 73: 269, 271.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sufficient military and naval forces to co-operate with those of Sweden and Norway in repelling Russian aggressions.[93]

The secret of the negotiations had been well kept, and, when the Swedish-Norwegian foreign office in a circular despatch of December 18 broke the news to the world, it caused considerable stir, a good deal of surprise, and many conjectures as to its real meaning and purpose. In Sweden the treaty met with some criticism,[94] and the Danes felt aggrieved because they believed it had broken the unity of the north.[95] Denmark had been aided by Russia in the recent Schleswig-Holstein trouble and she could therefore not join in an act which seemed unfriendly to that power.

Russia, as might be expected, was astonished at the news. Count Nesselrode said that "after forty years of the most friendly relations between his government and that of Sweden he had not expected such a proof of lack of confidence".[96] And the emperor, Alexander II., disclaimed any thought of ever "taking a village that belonged to another state", and said that there was no basis for the distrust which had occasioned the conclusion of the treaty.[97]

All the leading English newspapers united in welcoming it as averting a serious danger. The erroneous belief that Russia had no ice-free harbors in the north seems to have been held quite generally, and this of course enhanced the supposed value of the treaty. The *Times,* then at the height of its power, welcomed it as a sign of far-seeing and prudent statesmanship on the part of the British government. Having shown how great was the strategic importance of Finmark, a leading article of December 19 concludes by saying that the treaty placed "what we may fairly hope is an insurmountable obstacle between that aggressive government [*i.e.,* that of Russia] and the object of its fondest desire,—an access to the Atlantic Ocean

[93] F. O. 94: 470. The text of the treaty is printed in *British and Foreign State Papers,* 1855, p. 33.

[94] For criticism by the Swedish papers *Svenska Tidningen* and Göteborg *Handels- och Sjöfarts-Tidning,* see Halvdan Koht, in *Dagbladet,* Christiania, Apr. 19, 1907. Koht's article was subsequently printed separately under the title *Novembertraktaten* (Christiania, 1907). See also Fredrik Bajer, *Nordens særlig Danmarks Neutralitet under Krimkrigen* (Copenhagen, 1914), pp. 582–584.

[95] When Magenis first broached the question of a treaty of guaranty, Oscar I. suggested that Denmark might also be included, but did not insist upon it. Magenis to Clarendon, July 11, 1854, F. O. 73: 270. For its reception in Denmark see Bajer, pp. 576–620, *passim.*

[96] Quoted in a despatch from O. Plessen, Danish minister in St. Petersburg, to L. N. Scheele, Danish minister of foreign affairs, Dec. 18, 1855. *Ibid.,* p. 588.

[97] Plessen to Scheele, Dec. 28, 1855, *ibid.,* p. 590. See also *Diplomatic Study of the Crimean War* (London, 1882), II. 335–338.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never closed by ice, and within a few days' sail of the shores of France, England, and Germany ".[98]

Many, then and since, connected the treaty with the earlier negotiations and refused to believe that its main object was to guard against Russian aggression in Finmark.[99] Some thought that it contained a secret article binding Sweden and Norway to make war upon Russia,[100] and others held that even without such an article it served as a first step towards war.[101] It contained no secret article, and we have seen that its connection with the Crimean War might be called accidental. Crowe and Palmerston bore the chief responsibility for it, and Palmerston thought only of Finmark.[102] On the other hand, the war and the French negotiations doubtless prepared the way by causing Oscar I. to think in terms of an entente with the Western Powers in place of the old one with Russia. And he would hardly have risked the challenge implied by the treaty if his powerful neighbor had not been fully occupied elsewhere.

If the war had lasted another year the signing of the November treaty might have become the prelude to a general struggle in the north. Napoleon III. continued his efforts to achieve this end. While the negotiations were in progress General Canrobert came to Stockholm, and his mission was rightly seen as a part of the French scheme to secure an offensive alliance.[103] This was also discussed in conversations between the crown prince and Magenis;[104] but the coming of the peace brought these efforts to an end.

Whether Russia actually intended to move her frontier to the western ocean one can not determine without access to her secret archives.[105] Some of her activities in 1840 might well arouse sus-

[98] See also leading article, Dec. 25, and *Morning Post,* Dec. 20 and 21, *Globe,* Dec. 19 and 25, and *Daily News,* Dec. 20, 1855.

[99] Bajer, pp. 564, 565; Hallendorff, pp. 92–94; Koht, *Novembertraktaten.*

[100] Bajer, p. 576; Koht, p. 12.

[101] Hallendorff, p. 117; *Morning Post,* Dec. 21, 1855.

[102] W. Plessen, Danish minister in Stockholm, suspected that Crowe had something to do with the movement for concluding this treaty, but lacked definite proofs. Despatch to Scheele, Dec. 21, 1855, quoted by Bajer, p. 583.

[103] Count Walewski admitted to Lord Cowley that the general should discuss with Oscar I. plans for an offensive against Russia. Cowley to Clarendon, Oct. 30, 1855, F. O. 27: 1078. See also Hallendorff, pp. 117–121.

[104] Magenis to Clarendon, June 13, 1856, F. O. 73: 278. During the king's visit to Norway in the summer of 1855 Crowe discussed with him and with Prince Oscar the possibility of the united kingdoms entering the war. And Crowe found both leaning in that direction. Crowe to Clarendon, July 31, Aug. 21, 1855, F. O. 73: 272.

[105] That Russia nourished plans for seizing a portion of northern Norway is the opinion of Knut Gjerset (*History of the Norwegian People,* New York, 1915, II. 516, 517), and Theofran Save (*Sveriges Historia under den Nyaste Tiden.*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

picion,[106] and her attitude on the questions dealing with the Lapps seems to give good reasons for the fear of ulterior motives. That she had such was generally believed by the Norwegians and in this respect Crowe gave true reports of the popular view. He may have had his own private ax to grind in directing Palmerston's attention to Finmark, and the result benefited this adventurer who had great "inequalities of character" and in truth experienced many vicissitudes of fortune.[107] But whatever Crowe's motives may have been and whether the fear of Russia was justified or not, this fear, and the use made of it, caused a change in the foreign relations of the two Scandinavian states. The November treaty, as well as the previous acts of Lord Palmerston, reveal the vigilance with which this energetic and chauvinistic British statesman watched and tried to forestall every move on the part of Russia. Although the contingency anticipated by the treaty never arose, it formed a link in the diplomatic chain which bound Britain to the Continent at a time when she ostensibly followed a policy of splendid isolation.[108] Considered by the close of the century as having little or no practical value, it was finally abrogated shortly after the dissolution of the union between Sweden and Norway.[109]

PAUL KNAPLUND.

Stockholm, 1890, pp. 152, 153). It seems certain, however, that the British fear for the safety of Finmark can not be counted among the causes of the Crimean War as is done by Theodor Schiemann, *Geschichte Russlands unter Kaiser Nikolaus I.* (Berlin, 1904–1919), IV. 264. Bajer accepts at face value, p. 619, the statements by Alexander II. and Count Nesselrode that Russia had no desire to seize Norwegian harbors.

106 "A Norwegian", O. Richter, later minister of state, in the *Times,* Oct. 18, 1855; Helland, *Finmarkens Amt,* II. 755.

107 According to his own statements, Crowe began his career serving six years in the Russian navy under his uncle Admiral Crowe and under Admiral Grieg. Professor Nielsen thinks that in 1819–1820 Crowe was actively engaged in smuggling along the coast of northern Norway. His later career we have followed. In 1859 he became "Companion of the Bath"; he was knighted July 4, 1874, and died in Christiania the year after.

108 For a general debate on Britain's obligations under the various treaties of guaranties, including the one discussed in this paper, see Hansard, third series, CCX. 1151–1183, House of Commons, Apr. 12, 1872.

109 The territorial integrity of Norway was guaranteed by the powers by treaty of Nov. 2, 1907. See *Archives Diplomatiques,* CVII. 179–180. At this time the treaty of November, 1855, ceased to exist as far as Britain, France, and Norway were concerned. The *Annual Register,* 1908, p. 367.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REICHSTADT AGREEMENT

THE memorable interview between Francis Joseph and Alexander II., so important for all relations between Austria and Russia, occurred on July 8, 1876, at Reichstadt in Bohemia. Besides the two sovereigns, both Andrássy and Gorchakov were present. The unusual importance of this meeting lies in the fact that the decisions here framed were of far-reaching effect in determining the fate of Turkey and formed the point of departure for the Austrian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

These Reichstadt agreements were, however, for many years *terra incognita* upon which few historians had the temerity to venture. Even the other European foreign offices had been but gradually or incompletely initiated into the secret. When Austria in 1908 annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina, interest revived afresh. Thus in November, 1908, the *Fortnightly Review* published an anonymous article,[1] signed "Diplomaticus", which gave for the time an entirely characteristic account of the terms agreed on at Reichstadt. It is now plain that this was merely a "daring invention", as the Austrian historian Wertheimer has stigmatized it.[2] Down to the publication of the second volume of the latter's *Graf Julius Andrássy* in 1913, however, this was generally believed to give a correct approximation of the agreement, and so late as 1918 these terms were given by the French historian Larmeroux.[3]

Fournier had however in 1909[4] foreshadowed the real truth, and Wertheimer's *Andrássy,* based as it was on the Austrian archives, presented at last an authoritative account. When after the World War the Vienna archives were opened and the text of the "Résumé des Pourparlers Secrets de Reichstadt" was published in the appendix to the English edition of the Pribram treaties,[5] Wertheimer found complete confirmation and it was believed that the final word on the subject had been said. This belief doubtless is still held by Western historians.

[1] *Fortnightly Review,* XC. 831 ff.

[2] Wertheimer, *Graf Julius Andrássy* (Stuttgart, 1913), II. 322.

[3] Jean Larmeroux, *La Politique Extérieure de l'Autriche-Hongrie* (Paris, 1918), I. 43.

[4] August Fournier, *Wie wir zu Bosnien kamen* (Vienna, 1909).

[5] *Secret Treaties of Austria-Hungary, 1879–1914,* edited by A. F. Pribram, English edition by A. C. Coolidge (Cambridge, Mass., 1921), II. 188–191.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But in 1922 the Moscow Soviet government published its collection of Russian secret documents, and among them it brought out the Russian "text of the Reichstadt agreement".[6] One naturally expected to find here a duplicate of the "Résumé" published by Pribram and Coolidge; instead we have another version, differing vitally from the Pribram text, but with fully as good a claim to authenticity. It is moreover quite extraordinary to find that Russia and Austria had in their archives such different texts of what evidently purport to be the same document. What does it mean? The solution of this problem will shed new light on an important question.

What, first, are the precise sources of these two texts of the Reichstadt agreement, the Pribram and the Soviet texts? According to a note made by Andrássy in his own hand on the Austrian document, it was "written down immediately after Reichstadt by Nowikoff" (the Russian ambassador) "at my dictation and communicated to the Russian Cabinet".[7] For the source of the Russian text we have a note by the editors at the head of the document which says: "The original is not in the archive. The text of this is written in the same hand as the report by Gorchakov of his conversation with Prince Bismarck on April 19, 1873."[8] The Soviet has also published this conversation with Bismarck, and a note to it[9] says that it was "written in the hand of an unknown scribe". As the conversation with Bismarck is a signed account by Gorchakov, dictated in the first person, the deduction is that the Soviet Reichstadt text was very probably written by some amanuensis or secretary of Gorchakov's, at the latter's dictation.

What we have then are two copies of the Reichstadt agreement, one by Andrássy, the other from the Russians, probably at Gorchakov's dictation. Do these two agree? As already said, they do not; neither in form nor in content. Yet they bear unmistakable evidence of a common origin. They are unlike in form in that the Russian text has explanatory notes running in a column parallel with the main text, while the entire Pribram text is in one column. Again, the Russian text alone is divided into two sections, "quant au présent" and "quant à l'avenir", while the entire Austrian text applies to the future. Judged by mere form, therefore, the documents are not copies.

Their contents show even greater discrepancies. To mention first the outstanding minor differences: (a) the Russian text de-

[6] *Krasnyi Arkhiv* (Moscow, 1922), I. 36–43.

[7] Pribram and Coolidge, *Secret Treaties*, II. 188, note.

[8] *Krasnyi Arkhiv*, I. 37.

[9] *Ibid.*, I. 21.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clares absolutely that the ports of Klek and Cattaro are to be closed at once; the Austrian text makes this depend on future Turkish victory and Montenegrin independence; (b) in case of Turkish success, the Austrian text assures Montenegro independence, while the Russian text is here completely silent; (c) the Austrian draft says Rumelia, Bulgaria, and Albania are to form autonomous principalities, while the Russian names only the first two; (d) the Russian parallel column alone expressly gives Batum to Russia, although the Austrian text plainly assigns it by inference; (e) the Russian draft gives Thessaly and Epirus, the Austrian Thessaly and Crete, to Greece.

The most striking difference is that concerning Bosnia and Herzegovina. According to the Russian text:

> le Monténégro et la Serbie pourront s'annexer: le premier l'Herzégovine et un port sur l'Adriatique, la seconde quelques parties de la vieille Serbie et de la Bosnie. Mais, en pareil cas, l'Autriche aura la faculté de s'annexer la Croatie Turque et quelques parties de la Bosnie contigues à ses frontières, d'après un tracé à convenir.[10]

Thus Austria is to have only Turkish Croatia and some parts of Bosnia contiguous with the Austrian frontier, while Herzegovina is assigned to Montenegro. Let us compare the Austrian document:

> l'on est convenu que la Serbie obtiendrait une extension de territoire du côté de la Drina en Bosnie, en même tems que du côté de Novi-Bazar dans l'ancienne Serbie et dans la direction du Lim. De son côté le Monténégro serait arrondi par l'annexion d'une partie de l'Herzégovine adjacente; il obtiendrait le port de Spizza ainsi qu'un agrandissement du côté du Lim. . . . Le reste de la Bosnie et de l'Herzégovine serait annexé à l'Autriche-Hongrie.[11]

Austria is here given all of Bosnia and Herzegovina, except the "extensions" in those territories allotted to Serbia and Montenegro and intended to "round them off".

That neither of these two documents is a fabrication or an accident is pretty well supported by the Russian writers Goriainov and Tatishchev, as well as by the subsequent negotiations between Austria and Russia which led up to the January conventions of 1877. For both Goriainov and Tatishchev had access to the Russian archives, and both present curious compounds of the Russian and Austrian drafts. Goriainov, doubtless with better archival facilities, is much the more valuable here.

Already in 1907 Serge Goriainov, director of the Archives of the Russian Empire and of the Central Archives at St. Petersburg, had

[10] *Ibid.*, I. 38.

[11] Pribram and Coolidge, *Secret Treaties*, II. 190.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

published from his Russian documents an account of the Reichstadt *pourparlers* which differed substantially from the Wertheimer one,[12] but whose "inaccuracies" left Wertheimer, firm in his reliance on the Austrian documents, merely perplexed.[13] Now Goriainov both here and later presents striking confirmation of the Russian text. In giving his summary of the Reichstadt agreement he first follows exactly the Austrian text, giving Montenegro's and Serbia's aggrandizements in agreement. But when he comes to Austria's share, he suddenly leaves the Pribram terms and gives instead exactly what the Soviet draft specifies, namely, Turkish Croatia and "des territoires en Bosnie adjacents à la frontière".[14] He closes his account with a garbled version of the two. On what did he base this summary? According to his own references, his sources were the correspondence of Gorchakov for 1876, particularly a letter from Vienna dated July 11/22. It seems likely that Goriainov saw neither of our two drafts, but based his account on letters between Gorchakov and Vienna. Tatishchev, less important here, mentions[15] "territorial compensation in Bosnia and in part of Herzegovina" as Austria's stipulation at Reichstadt; he does not mention his source, and may have used only the January convention.

Much more important for confirmation of the divergent Russian and Austrian views of what happened at Reichstadt are the negotiations which led up to the conventions of January 15, 1877. Bismarck had not been completely informed of the Reichstadt bargain until September 14, 1876, when Andrássy made a "complete confession" to Stolberg, the German ambassador.[16] Andrássy then said that Russia was to be placed in the "possession of her natural frontiers, and Austria in that of Bosnia". Barring the meagre possibility that Andrássy meant to include Herzegovina in "Bosnia", one is tempted to ask, had Reichstadt given him only Bosnia, and did he know it and refrain from mentioning Herzegovina through fear it would reach Russian ears. Goriainov says in this connection that the original bargain had been only Bosnia, but that by September

[12] French edition used, Goriainov, *Le Bosphore et les Dardanelles* (Paris, 1910).

[13] In his recent articles in the *Historische Blätter,* Wertheimer shows himself still unaware of the importance of Goriainov here. Wertheimer, "Neues zur Orientpolitik des Grafen Andrássy, 1876–1877", in *Historische Blätter,* Hefte II., III., pp. 264–276, 448–463.

[14] Goriainov, p. 318.

[15] S. S. Tatishchev, *Imperator Aleksandr II.* (St. Petersburg, 1903), II. 315–316.

[16] *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette, 1871–1914* (Berlin, 1922), II. 45 ff., Stolberg to Bismarck.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Austrian military party had persuaded the emperor of the necessity of annexing Herzegovina as well.[17]

However that may be, when in his letter of September 11/23, 1876, Alexander proposed to Vienna the joint "démarche" in the Balkans, he mentioned only Bosnia for occupation by Austrian troops and breathed not a syllable about Herzegovina.[18] It is well to remember that Gorchakov was here making a strong bid for Austrian support, and would not, it seems, then of all times have backed out of a Reichstadt pledge.

In his reply, however, Francis Joseph coupled Herzegovina with Bosnia in saying that "Austria could never permit the granting of political autonomy to Bosnia and Herzegovina".[19] This is the beginning of the difference. In a memorandum, sent October 12 by Gorchakov[20] for Novikov's private information, the former says Austria will not dare create embarrassments for Russia in her prospective march on Turkey, if the march be rapid; and by letting Austria take Bosnia, he says, Austria will be satisfied. It is scarcely necessary to point out that Gorchakov must have known she would not be satisfied if Reichstadt had led her to expect Herzegovina also. In another memorandum for Novikov, dated October 26, Gorchakov likewise complains that Vienna was willing to sit by and let Russia take all the risks in the Balkans, while as a result Austria would have "Bosnia" in its hands.[21] Always "Bosnia" when Gorchakov is speaking; this is scarcely an accident.

When it came to the actual drawing-up of the January convention, one of the two points warmly disputed was just this, whether Austria could occupy and administer Herzegovina in addition to Bosnia. The correspondence here makes the conclusion absolutely inescapable that there somehow was a real misunderstanding on this point between the two powers.

First on November 2 Gorchakov fortified his ambassador with full instructions for negotiating the convention. If Austria judges it necessary to enter Bosnia, that movement must be divested of all hostility to Russia, and the Vienna Cabinet must promise "not to extend the sphere of its military influence to Rumania, Serbia, Herzegovina, or Montenegro". At Reichstadt, Gorchakov goes on to say, Andrássy was content with Croatia and a strip of Bosnian territory, in order to rectify the Dalmatian frontier. Andrássy, he tells

[17] Goriainov, p. 319.
[18] Wertheimer, *Julius Andrássy*, II. 342–343.
[19] *Ibid.*, II. 344.
[20] Goriainov, p. 325.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 326.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Novikov, had promised him a detailed map of Bosnia, indicating this rectification. But this map has not been sent by Andrássy, who lately has put Herzegovina into the sphere of Austrian occupation.[22]

The important thing about this clear statement made privately by Gorchakov and printed by Goriainov in 1907, is that it corresponds *in toto* with the Soviet text now published. When Novikov later, in the course of a conversation with Francis Joseph on November 15, expressed these views, the Austrian monarch replied as clearly that Herzegovina had been included at Reichstadt in the domain of Austrian influence. Andrássy confirmed the same thing. "Il expliqua l'omission de l'Herzégovine dans la notice redigée à Reichstadt par une erreur de plume ('lapsus calami')."[23]

These are important statements and deserve a moment's pause. If Andrássy here admitted that Herzegovina was not mentioned in the Reichstadt agreement, the Reichstadt text as found in the Austrian archives loses practically all validity. The weak link here of course is Goriainov; we can not be sure how correctly he has transcribed Novikov's report, nor how correctly Novikov had reported Andrássy. And against this statement of Andrássy we must set his own note on the Austrian draft, already quoted.

Further confirmation of this Russian viewpoint has been found by Wertheimer, and this in the Vienna archives. Gorchakov here, through Novikov, categorically tells Andrássy that at Reichstadt the talk had been about Turkish Croatia and about a part of Bosnia, but never about Herzegovina as Austria's share. "Ni l'Empereur ni moi nous ne nous souvenons que le mot même de l'Herzégovine ait été prononcé dans ce sens."[24] Sufficiently emphatic, that! Wertheimer quotes Andrássy as replying to this that Herzegovina had been expressly mentioned in the "aide-mémoire" which he dictated to Novikov after Reichstadt, that Novikov had sent this on to St. Petersburg, and that no protest against it had ever been made by Gorchakov.

Thus we have the contradictory misunderstanding clearly set forth. The important thing is that these contradictions are in complete harmony, respectively, with the two texts now published. It is superfluous further to pursue this squabble in the negotiations. Suffice it to say that Russia, feeling Austrian support a *sine qua non* for the war, at length agreed to the high price exacted; and in the

[22] Goriainov, pp. 328–329, quoting from Gorchakov's despatch to Vienna of Oct. 21/Nov. 2, 1876.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 329, based on Novikov's despatch of Nov. 3/15, 1876.

[24] Wertheimer, *Julius Andrássy*, II. 384, quoting from Gorchakov's despatch to Novikov, Nov. 23/Dec. 5, 1876.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

January conventions Herzegovina was included with Bosnia in the sphere for occupation by Austria. But this in no way proves that Austria was right as to the Reichstadt happenings. The fact remains that Gorchakov insisted throughout that Herzegovina had not been promised at Reichstadt, nor even mentioned in that sense; that Andrássy probably admitted its exclusion from the Reichstadt "notice", and later said he had dictated to Novikov what we now have as the Pribram text.

The difference is clear. The problem remains, is either of these two texts an authoritative one, or do both merely represent individual opinion? Let us consider the character of the Reichstadt meeting. The agreements here made, it must be remembered, were in no sense definite engagements, permanently binding both parties, but rather points of view for an eventual common action in the future in case of a Russo-Turkish war, which war could not as yet be considered a certainty.[25] "The document of Reichstadt", says Fournier, "was, according to all that can be learned, no protocol and no definite compact, but a sort of 'aide-mémoire' which the two ministers dictated to one of their assistants."[26] Tatishchev says to the same effect that the "reciprocal obligations were not put down in protocols, but were written down in the words of the ministers present at the meeting".[27] The Rumanian Cogălniceanu even handled the two copies, if we may believe Karathéodory Pasha. In his "Rapport Secret" the latter says:

> Il est bon de noter que l'origine de cette question [of Bosnia and Herzegovina] . . . remonterait, s'il faut en croire certains récits, à l'entrevue des empereurs à Reichstadt. . . . Du moins, c'est ce qui a été affirmé sous serment par M. Cogalniceano. Ce dernier a déclaré avoir eu entre les mains copie de deux documents écrits au crayon, l'un par le prince Gortchakov, l'autre par le comte Andrássy et échangés entre eux à Reichstadt. Ces deux écrits, qui étaient formulés comme de *simples séries d'idées,* admettaient, dans l'hypothèse d'une guerre turco-russe, la rétrocession de la Bessarabie à la Russie et l'extension de l'Autriche en Bosnie-Herzégovine.[28]

In view of all this, and in view of Andrássy's plain statement that his dictation was written down after the meeting, we may feel that now at last we have a complete theory. As to whether or not anything definite had been agreed on in the meeting itself, we shall perhaps never learn. Whether the discussion had been so vague or

[25] See Wertheimer in the *Historische Blätter, op. cit.*

[26] Fournier, p. 21, note.

[27] Tatishchev, II. 316.

[28] Karathéodory Pasha, *Le Rapport Secret sur le Congrès de Berlin* (Paris, 1919), p. 130. Hanotaux, in his *Histoire de la France Contemporaine,* IV. 364, quoted this passage in 1908.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inconclusive on the disputed points that Andrássy and Gorchakov were entitled to an honest difference of opinion, or whether on the other hand one or both shaded their memories to suit their preferences, must remain beyond our province. What we may pretty certainly conclude is that the Reichstadt agreement was merely an oral one; that no document was drawn up during the meeting itself; that after the meeting each minister made a memorandum of his understanding of this verbal agreement; and that these memoranda bore important differences which each minister could support in the subsequent negotiations. What we now quite evidently have are these memoranda, dictated by the two ministers as résumés of their understanding of the Reichstadt bargain.

Wonder has long been expressed that Russia at Reichstadt so readily agreed to the high price exacted by Austria. It is now disclosed that these terms were in dispute and that Russia agreed to them only after six additional months of negotiation.

GEORGE HOOVER RUPP.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PROGRESS OF CONSTITUTIONAL THEORY BETWEEN THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND THE MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION

CRITICS of Gladstone's famous aphorism on the Constitution seem often to assume that he supposed the members of the Philadelphia Convention to have emptied their minds of all experience upon their arrival in the convention city.[1] The assumption is an entirely gratuitous one. Unquestionably the problems before the Convention were suggested by the experience of its members and were not posed *ex thesi*. But the fact remains, nevertheless, that the solutions which the Convention supplied to those problems not infrequently owed far more to the theoretical prepossessions of its members than they did to tested institutions.

For Americans hardly less than for Frenchmen the period of the Constitution was "an age of rationalism", whereby is intended not a blind ignoring of the lessons of experience, but confidence in the ability of reason, working in the light of experience, to divert the unreflective course of events into beneficial channels; and in no respect was man more the master of his destiny than in that of statecraft. Surely if any man of the time may be regarded as representative of the sober, unimaginative intelligence of America, it was Washington, in whose "Circular Letter addressed to the Governors", of June 8, 1783, occurs the following passage:

> The foundation of our empire was not laid in the gloomy age of ignorance and superstition; but at an epocha when the rights of mankind were better understood and more clearly defined, than at any other period. The researches of the human mind after social happiness have been carried to a great extent; the treasures of knowledge acquired by the labors of philosophers, sages, and legislators, through a long succession of years, are laid open for our use, and their collected wisdom may be

[1] See, *e.g.*, R. L. Schuyler, *Constitution of the United States*, p. 5. Professor Schuyler voices the opinion (p. 6) that "the Constitution is not to be regarded as in any true sense an original creative act of the Convention at Philadelphia, which framed it". It is interesting to oppose to this sentiment the following passage from Professor Roscoe Pound's *Interpretations of Legal History*, p. 127: "Except as an act of omnipotence, creation does not mean the making of something out of nothing. Creative activity takes materials and gives them form so that they may be put to uses for which the materials unformed are not adapted." Professor Schuyler's sweeping statement would probably be quite as near the truth if the word "not" were omitted from it.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

happily applied in the establishment of our forms of government. . . . At this auspicious period, the United States came into existence as a nation; and, if their citizens should not be completely free and happy, the fault will be entirely their own.[2]

The same sense of command over the resources of political wisdom appears again and again in the debates of the Convention, in the pages of the *Federalist,* and in writings of contemporaries.[3]

Nor does the economic interpretation of history, of which one has heard much in late years, detract greatly from the significance of such facts. No one denies that the concern felt by the Fathers for the rights of property and contract contributed immensely to impart to American constitutional law its strong bias in favor of these rights from the outset, but the concession only serves to throw certain still unanswered questions into a higher relief. For, what warrant had these men for translating any of their interests as *rights*; and why did they adopt the precise means which they did to advance their interests or secure their rights—in other words, why did they choose the precise system set up by the Constitution to do the work which they put upon it? Questions of this nature are altogether incapable of answer by any theory of human motive standing by itself. As Sir Henry Maine has phrased it: "Nothing in law springs entirely from a sense of convenience. There are always certain ideas existing antecedently on which the sense of convenience works, and of which it can do no more than form some new combination; and to find these ideas", he adds, "is exactly the problem."[4]

I.

A colloquy which occurred between Madison and Sherman of Connecticut in the early days of the Philadelphia Convention as to its purposes affords an excellent preface to the more particular intention of this paper. "The objects of the Union", Sherman had declared, "were few", defense, domestic good order, treaties, the regulation of foreign commerce, revenue. Though a conspicuous omission from this enumeration is of any mention of commerce

[2] *Writings,* ed. Ford, X. 254, 256.

[3] See Farrand, *Records of the Federal Convention,* I. 83–84, 134–135, 137, 139, 151–152, 161, 254, 285 ff., 304 ff., 317, 356, 398 ff., 426 ff., 437–438, 444–449, 451, etc. The lessons of the past, its successes and failures, are cited for the most part. The term "political science" is used by Mercer, *ibid.,* II. 284, while "the science of politics" is Hamilton's expression in *Federalist,* no. 9 (ed. Lodge). This, he says, "has undergone great improvement". The entire passage is worth perusal in this connection. See also Madison in *Federalist,* nos. 14 and 47, and Adams's preface to his *Defence* (*Works,* IV. 283–298).

[4] *Ancient Law* (New York, 1888), p. 226.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among the states and its regulation, it was not this omission which drew Madison's fire:

> He differed from the member from Connecticut in thinking the objects mentioned to be all the principal ones that required a National Government. Those were certainly important and necessary objects; but he combined with them the necessity, of providing more effectually for the security of private rights, and the steady dispensation of Justice. Interferences with these were evils which had more perhaps than any thing else, produced this convention. Was it to be supposed that republican liberty could long exist under the abuses of it practiced in some of the States? [5]

These views were heartily chorused by other members: the faulty organization of government within the states, threatening as it did, not alone the Union, but republican government itself, furnished the Convention with a problem of transcendent, even world-wide importance.[6]

In short, the task before the Convention arose by no means exclusively from the inadequacies of the Articles of Confederation for "the exigencies of the Union"; of at least equal urgency were the questions which were thrust upon its attention by the shortcomings of the state governments for their purposes. Indeed, from the point of view of this particular study the latter phase of the Convention's task is, if anything, the more significant one, both because it brings us into contact at the outset with the most persistent problem of American constitutional law—that which has arisen from the existence of a multiplicity of local legislatures with indefinite powers; and also because it was to the solution of this phase of its problem that the Convention brought its "political science" most immediately to bear.

The singular juxtaposition in the Revolutionary state constitutions of legislative supremacy and the doctrine of natural rights need not detain us here.[7] In the words of a contemporary critic of those constitutions: Although their authors "understood perfectly the principles of liberty", yet most of them "were ignorant of the forms and combinations of power in republics".[8] Madison's protest, on the other hand, against "interferences with the steady dispensation of justice" had reference to something more subtle—to what, in fact,

[5] Farrand, I. 133–134.

[6] *Ibid.*, I. 48, 255, 424, 525, 533, II. 285.

[7] See W. C. Webster, "State Constitutions of the American Revolution", in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May, 1897.

[8] Niles, *Principles and Acts of the Revolution*, p. 234; from an address by Dr. Benjamin Rush delivered at Philadelphia on July 4, 1787, before members of the Convention and others. The address testifies throughout to the importance of the governmental situation in the states as a problem before the Convention.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was far less a structural than a functional defect in these early instruments of government. That the majority of the Revolutionary constitutions recorded recognition of the principle of the separation of powers is, of course, well known.[9] What is not so generally understood is that the recognition was verbal merely, for the reason that the material terms in which it was couched still remained undefined; and that this was true in particular of "legislative power" in relation to "judicial power".

It is pertinent in this connection to compare the statement by a modern authority of what is law to-day with actual practice contemporaneous with the framing of the Constitution of the United States. "The legislature", writes Sutherland in his work on *Statutory Construction,*

> may prescribe rules of decision which will govern future cases. . . . But it has no power to administer judicial relief—it can not decide cases nor direct how existing cases or controversies shall be decided by the courts; it can not interfere by subsequent acts with final judgments of the courts. It can not set aside, annul, or modify such judgments, nor grant or order new trials, nor direct what judgment shall be entered or relief given. No declaratory act, that is, one professing to enact what the law now is or was at any past time, can affect any existing rights or controversies.[10]

Turn now to the operation of the principle of the separation of powers in a typical instance in 1787. The New Hampshire constitution of 1784 contained the declaration that "in the government of this State, the three essential powers thereof, to wit, the legislative, executive and judicial, ought to be kept as separate and independent of each other as the nature of a free government will admit or as is consistent with the chain of connection that binds the whole fabric of the constitution in one indissoluble bond of union or amity". Notwithstanding which the laws of New Hampshire for the years 1784–1792 are replete with entries showing that throughout this period the state legislature freely vacated judicial proceedings, suspended judicial actions, annulled or modified judgments, cancelled executions, reopened controversies, authorized appeals, granted exemptions from the standing law, expounded the law for pending cases, and even determined the merits of disputes.[11] Nor do such

[9] See *Federalist*, no. 47.

[10] Sec. 11 (second edition, ed. Lewis).

[11] See *Laws of New Hampshire*, ed. Batchellor, V. *passim*. Some of the less usual items are those on pp. 21, 66, 89, 90–91, 110–111, 125–126, 130–131, 167–168, 243, 320–321, 334–335, 363, 395–396, 400–401, 404–406, 411–412, 417–418, 455–456, 485, 499, 522. The volume is crowded with acts "restoring" a defeated or defaulting party "to his law", "any usage, custom, or law to the contrary notwithstanding".

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practices seem to have been more aggravated in New Hampshire than in several other states. Certainly they were widespread, and they were evidently possible in any of the states under the views then obtaining of "legislative power".[12]

Neither is the explanation of such views far to seek. Coke's fusion of what we should to-day distinguish as "legislative" and "judicial" powers in the case of the "High Court of Parliament" represented the teaching of the highest of all legal authorities before Blackstone appeared on the scene.[13] What is equally important, the Cokian doctrine corresponded exactly to the contemporary necessities of many of the colonies in the earlier days of their existence.[14] Thus, owing to the dearth not only of courts and lawyers, but even of a recognized code of law, bodies like the Massachusetts General Court had thrust upon them at first a far greater bulk of judicial and administrative work, in to-day's sense of these terms, than of lawmaking proper, while conversely such judges as existed in these early days performed administrative as well as judicial functions, very much as had been the case with the earliest itinerant judges in England. By the middle of the eighteenth century, it is true, a distinct improvement had taken place in these regards. Regularly organized systems of courts now existed in all the colonies. A bar trained in the common law was rapidly arising. Royal governors sometimes disallowed enactments interfering with the usual course of justice in the ordinary courts, on grounds anticipatory of modern doctrine.[15] Then, however, came the outbreak of the Revolution, and with it a reversion to more primitive practices and ideas, traceable in the first instance to the collapse of the royal judicial establishment, but later to the desire to take a short course with enemies of the new régime, against whom, first and last, every state in the Union appears to have enacted bills of pains and penalties of greater or less severity.[16] Furthermore, it should be observed that, owing to a popular prejudice, certain of the states—notably New York and Massachusetts—at first withheld equity powers from their courts altogether, while several others granted them but sparingly.[17] The result was fairly to compel the legislature to intervene in many instances with "special legislation", disallowing fraudulent transactions, curing defec-

[12] See the references I have collected in my *Doctrine of Judicial Review*, pp. 69–71; also Baldwin, *The American Judiciary*, ch. II.

[13] McIlwain, *The High Court of Parliament and its Supremacy*, ch. III.

[14] Baldwin, *op. cit.*, ch. I.

[15] See, *e.g.*, *Messages from the Governors* (of New York), ed. Lincoln, I. 55.

[16] A good summary of legislative persecution of the Loyalists appears in Van Tyne, *American Revolution*, pp. 255 ff.

[17] *Two Centuries' Growth of American Law*, pp. 129–133.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive titles, authorizing urgent sales of property, and the like.[18] Between legislation of this species and outright interferences with the remedial law itself there was often little to distinguish.

That, therefore, the vague doctrine of the separation of powers should at first have been interpreted and applied in the light of this history is not astonishing. This, as we have seen, left legislative power without definition on its side toward judicial power, except as the power of the supreme organ of the state, which meant, however, the withholding from judicial power of that which, to the modern way of thinking, is its highest attribute—to wit, power of deciding with finality. Nothing could be more instructive in this connection than some sentences from Jefferson's *Notes on Virginia,* dating from about 1781. Pointing out that the Virginia constitution of 1776 incorporated the principle of the separation of powers, Jefferson proceeds to expound this principle in a way which leaves it meaning little more than a caution against plurality of offices. "No person shall exercise the powers of more than one of them [the three departments] at the same time", are his words. But even more significant is the following passage:

> If, [it runs] the legislature assumes executive and judiciary powers, no opposition is likely to be made; nor, if made, can it be effectual; because in that case they may put their proceedings into the form of an act of assembly, which will render them obligatory on the other branches. They have, accordingly, in many instances, decided rights which should have been left to judiciary controversy; and the direction of the executive, during the whole time of their session, is becoming habitual and familiar.[19]

The concept of legislative power here expressed is obviously a purely formal one: "legislative power" is any power which the legislative organ may choose to exercise by resort to the ordinary parliamentary processes.

And not less striking is the recital which Hamilton gives in *Federalist,* number 81, of certain objections by opponents of the Constitution to the powers of the Supreme Court:

> The authority of the Supreme Court of the United States, which is to be a separate and independent body, will be superior to that of the legislature. The power of construing the laws according to the *spirit* of the Constitution will enable that court to mould them into whatever shape it may think proper; especially as its decisions will not be in any manner subject to the revision or correction of the legislative body. This is as unprecedented as it is dangerous. . . . The Parliament of Great Britain, and the legislatures of the several States, can at any time rectify, by law,

[18] Cooley, *Constitutional Limitations,* ch. V.

[19] *Writings,* Memorial ed., II. 163–164. See to the same effect Chief Justice Pendleton's words in 4 Call 5, 17 (Va., 1782).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the exceptionable decisions of their respective courts. But the errors and usurpations of the Supreme Court of the United States will be uncontrollable and remediless.

Hamilton's answer to all this was simply that "the theory neither of the British, nor the State constitutions, authorizes the revisal of a judicial sentence by a legislative act", that "the impropriety of the thing" even in the case of the United States Constitution rested not on any distinctive provision thereof, but "on the general principles of law and reason"; that a legislature could not, "without exceeding its province . . . reverse a determination once made in a particular case," though it might "prescribe a new rule for future cases"; and that this principle applied "in all its consequences, exactly in the same manner and extent, to the State governments as to the national government".[20] This answer, for which is cited only the authority of Montesquieu, is conclusive from the standpoint of modern constitutional doctrine; but its contradiction of the views and practices which were prevalent in 1787 is manifest.

II.

Finally, the structural and functional shortcomings of the early state constitutions played directly into the hands of both popular and doctrinal tendencies which distinctly menaced what Madison called "the security of private rights". Throughout the Revolution the Blackstonian doctrine of "legislative omnipotence" was in the ascendant. Marshall read Blackstone and so did Iredell—to what effect later developments were to make clear.[21] And even more radical doctrine was abroad. One Benjamin Hichborn's assertion, in a speech delivered in Boston in 1777, that civil liberty was "not a government by laws", but "a power existing in the people at large" "to alter or annihilate both the mode and essence of any former government" "for any cause or for no cause at all, but their own sovereign pleasure"[22] voiced an extension to the right of revolution hitherto unheard of outside the pages of Rousseau; and even so good

[20] In *Federalist*, no. 47, Madison also declares that "the entire legislature [*i.e.*, Parliament] can perform no judiciary act". This assertion is based on his reading of Montesquieu, but it is untrue even of Parliament to-day. Stephen, *Commentaries* (eleventh ed.), IV. 283; Pollard, *Evolution of Parliament*, p. 239.

[21] Iredell's perusal of Blackstone produced an entire change in his theory of the basis of judicial review. Compare McRee, *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell*, II. 172–173; and Calder *v.* Bull, 3 Dallas 386, 398. One aspect of Marshall's thinking on the same matter is touched upon briefly in note 40, *infra*.

[22] Niles, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a republican as John Adams was disturbed at manifestations of social ferment which he traced to a new spirit of equality.[23]

The sharp edge of "legislative omnipotence" did not pause with the Tories who, as enemies of the state, were perhaps beyond the pale of the Constitution. Everywhere legislative assemblies, energized by the reforming impulse of the period, were led to attempt results which, even when they lay within the proper field of lawmaking, we should to-day regard as requiring constitutional amendments to effect them. Virginia, as Bancroft writes, used her "right of original and complete legislation to abolish the privileges of primogeniture, cut off entails, forbid the slave-trade, and establish the principle of freedom in religion as the inherent and inalienable possession of spiritual beings";[24] while elsewhere the liberal forces of the hour assailed the vested interest of negro slavery more directly. Vermont, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire ridded themselves of slavery by constitutional amendment or in consequence of judicial construction of the Constitution.[25] In Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, on the other hand, gradual emancipation was brought about by ordinary legislative enactment.[26] Yet the cause of reform did not have it all its own way. When a similar measure was proposed in New Jersey, it drew forth a protest on constitutional grounds which is remarkable in its anticipation of later doctrines.[27]

But it was not reform, nor even special legislation, which early affixed to the state legislature a stigma of which as an institution it has never even yet quite ridded itself.[28] The legislation just reviewed belonged for the most part to the period of the war and was the work of a society which, the Tory element apart, was politically unified and acknowledged an easily ascertainable leadership. Once, however, hostilities were past and the pressure alike of a common peril and a common enthusiasm removed, the republican lute began to show rifts. The most evident line of cleavage at first was that between seaboard and back country; but this presently became coincident to a large extent with a much more ominous division into

[23] *Life and Works,* VI. 94–97; Morse, *The Federalist Party in Massachusetts,* pp. 68–69.

[24] *History* (New York, 1892), V. 329.

[25] Hart, *Slavery and Abolition,* p. 153. See also G. H. Moore, *Slavery in Massachusetts.*

[26] Hart, *op. cit.,* p. 154.

[27] Moore, *Diary of the American Revolution,* p. 362. See also *Works of Alexander Hamilton,* Constitutional ed. IV. 232.

[28] This seems to have been the origin of the American distrust of legislatures, upon which Bryce comments in his *American Commonwealth,* I. 427, 451 (second ed.).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creditors and debtors. That class of farmer-debtors which now began to align itself with the demagogues in the state legislatures, in opposition to the mercantile-creditor class, was experiencing the usual grievance of agriculturists after a war, that of shouldering the burden of the return to normalcy. But the point of view of the creditor class may not be justly ignored either. By their provincial policies with respect to commerce the state legislatures had already seriously impaired legitimate interests of this class,[29] and they now proceeded to attack what under the standing law were its unchallengeable rights. In each of the thirteen states a "rag money" party appeared, which in seven states triumphed outright, while in several others it came near doing so. Nor was payment even in paper currency always the creditor's lot, for besides rag-money measures and tender laws, or in lieu of them, statutes suspending all actions upon debts were enacted, payment of debts in kind was authorized, and even payment in land.[30]

It is a frequent maxim of policy that things must be permitted to grow worse before their betterment can be attempted to advantage. The paper-money craze at least proved serviceable in invigorating the criticism which had begun even earlier of the existing state governments. One such critic was Jefferson, who in his *Notes on Virginia* bitterly assailed the Virginia constitution of 1776 for having produced a concentration of power in the legislative assembly which answered to "precisely the definition of despotic government". Nor did it make any difference, he continued, that such powers were vested in a numerous body "chosen by ourselves"; "one hundred and seventy-three despots" were "as oppressive as one"; and "an elective despotism was not the government we fought for, but one which should not only be founded on free principles, but in which the powers of government should be so divided and balanced among several bodies of magistracy, as that no one could transcend their legal limits, without being effectually checked and restrained by the others".[31]

And this was also the point of view of the Pennsylvania Council of Censors, in their celebrated report of 1784.[32] Extending through some thirty finely printed pages, this document listed many examples,

[29] D. W. Brown, *The Commercial Power of Congress*, ch. II.; A. A. Giesecke, *American Commercial Legislation before 1789*.

[30] McLaughlin, *The Confederation and the Constitution*, ch. IX.

[31] *Writings*, Memorial ed., II. 160 ff.

[32] *Proceedings relative to the calling of the Conventions of 1776 and 1790* (Harrisburg, 1825), pp. 83 ff. For a contemporary criticism of the report, see *Federalist*, no. 49.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"selected", we are told, "from a multitude", of legislative violations of the state constitution and bill of rights. Several of the measures so stigmatized were of a general nature, but those for which the censors reserved their severest strictures were acts involving the rights of named parties. Thus fines had been remitted, judicially established claims disallowed, verdicts of juries set aside, the property of one given to another, defective titles secured, marriages dissolved, particular persons held in execution of debt released—and all by a species of legislative activity which had been explicitly condemned both by "the illustrious Montesquieu" and "the great Locke".

Two years later came the early volumes of John Adams's *Defence of the Constitutions,* in answer to M. Turgot's criticism that the American constitutions represented "an unreasonable imitation of the usages of England". In reality the work was much less a "defence" than an exhortation to constitutional reform in other states along the lines which Massachusetts had already taken under Adams's own guidance. A new and significant note, however, appears in this work. In his earlier writings Adams had assumed with Montesquieu that the great source of danger to liberty lay in the selfishness and ambition of the governors themselves. But with the lesson of the paper-money agitation before him, he now gives warning of the danger to which republics, when they have become populous and overcrowded and the inevitable doom of poverty has appeared in their midst, are peculiarly exposed from the rise of parties. "Misarrangements now made", he writes, "will have great, extensive, and distant consequences; and we are now employed, how little soever we may think of it, in making establishments which will affect the happiness of a hundred millions of inhabitants at a time, in a period not very distant." [33]

Copies of the *Defence* reached the United States early in 1787, and were circulated among the members of the Philadelphia Convention, reviving and freshening belief in "political science" and particularly in the teachings of Montesquieu. Yet in one respect at least the idea of reform for which Adams's work stood and that which the Convention represented were poles apart. For while the former still illustrated the opinion that constitutional reform was a purely local problem, the Convention represented the triumph of the idea that reform to be effective must be national in scope and must embrace the entire American constitutional system in a single coherent programme. That such a programme could have been elabo-

[33] *Works,* IV. 273 ff. The quotation is from p. 587.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rated without the signal contribution to it of the effort for local reform is, on the other hand, altogether improbable.

III.

It was Walter Bagehot's opinion that Americans were prone to give credit to the Constitution which was more justly due themselves. "The men of Massachusetts", he declared, "could work *any* constitution."[34] What had evidently impressed him was the American habit of supplying shortcomings in the Constitution by construction rather than outright amendment. Yet for construction to do really effective work, it must have elbow-room and a handle to take hold of; and at least the merit of having afforded these can not be denied the Constitution.

Nor were the early state constitutions entirely lacking in invitation to this American aptitude for documentary exegesis, which had its origin, one suspects, in an earlier taste for theological disquisition. The executive veto, which was the practical nub of all Adams's preachments, was brought about, to be sure, through specific provision being made for it in the written constitution, and to so good purpose that it is to be found to-day in nearly every constitution in the country.[35] The other suggested remedy of critics of "the legislative vortex", on the contrary, was introduced solely by the processes of interpretation and without the slightest textual alteration being made in the constitutions involved. This was judicial review. Thus while the executive veto and judicial review have a common explanation in the political necessity which they were devised to meet, the manner in which they were respectively articulated to the American constitutional system was widely and for us most significantly divergent. The executive veto was and remains mere matter of fact without the slightest further interest for us; judicial review is both a practice and a *doctrine,* and in the latter aspect especially is of immediate interest.

As a practice judicial review made its initial appearance in independent America in 1780, in the case of Holmes *v.* Walton,[36] in which the supreme court of New Jersey refused to carry out an act of the legislature providing for the trial of a designated class of offenders by a jury of six, whereas, the court held, the state constitution contemplated the common-law jury of twelve. Although the opinion of the court apparently was never published, the force of

[34] *The English Constitution* (New York, 1906), p. 296.

[35] F. J. Stimson, *Federal and State Constitutions,* sect. 304.

[36] Austin Scott, "Holmes *v.* Walton, the New Jersey Precedent", in *Am. Hist. Rev.,* IV. 456 ff.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the example may have been considerable. From this time on the notion crops up sporadically in other jurisdictions, at intervals of about two years, in a series of dicta and rulings which—thanks in no small part to popular misapprehension as to their precise bearing—brought the idea before the Philadelphia Convention.[37] And meantime the main premises of the *doctrine* of judicial review—the principles whereby it came to be annexed to the written constitution—had been worked out.

First and last, many and various arguments have been offered to prove that judicial review is implied in the very nature of a written constitution, some of them manifestly insufficient for the purpose; though that is not to say that they may not have assisted in securing general acceptance of the institution. "Superstitions believed are, in their effect, truths"; and it has accordingly happened more than once that the actual influence of an idea has been out of all proportion to its logical or scientific merits. These more or less spurious proofs of judicial review, however, we here pass by without further consideration, in order to come at once to what, on both historical and logical grounds, may be termed the true doctrine of judicial review. This embraces three propositions: First, that the Constitution is supreme; second, that it is law, in the sense of a rule enforceable by courts; and third, that judicial interpretations of the standing law are final, at least for the cases in the decision of which they are pronounced. Let us consider the two latter propositions somewhat further.

The claim of the Constitution to be considered *law* may rest on either one of two grounds, depending on whether "law" be regarded as an unfolding of the divine order of things or as an expression of human will—as an act of knowledge (or revelation) or an act of power.[38] Considered from the former point of view—which is that of Locke and other exponents of the law of nature—the claim of the Constitution to be obeyed is due simply to its content, to the principles which it incorporates because of their intrinsic sanctity; considered from the latter point of view—that of Hobbes and the "positive school of jurisprudence"—its claim to obedience is due to its source in a sovereign will—that of the people. Actually both views have been taken at different times, but that judicial review originally owed more to the former than to the latter conception seems fairly clear.

[37] See generally my *Doctrine of Judicial Review*, pp. 71–75, and references there given.

[38] Holland, *Elements of Jurisprudence*, thirteenth ed., pp. 19–21, 32–34, 41–45.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of all the so-called "precedents" for judicial review antecedent to the Convention of 1787, the one which called forth the most elaborate argument on theoretical grounds and which produced the most evident impression on the membership of the Convention, was the Rhode Island case of Trevett *v.* Weeden,[39] which was decided early in 1786. The feature of the case which is of immediate pertinence is the argument which it evoked against the act on the part of the attorney for defendant, James Varnum. In developing the theory of a law superior to legislative enactments, Varnum appealed indifferently to the Rhode Island charter, "general principles", "invariable custom", "Magna Carta", "fundamental law", "the law of nature", "the law of God"; asserting with reference to the last, that "all men, judges included", were bound by it "in preference to any human laws". In short, Varnum, going directly back to the Cokian tradition, built his argument for judicial review on the loose connotation of the word "law" still obtaining in the eighteenth century, especially among American readers of Coke and Locke—to say nothing of the host of writers on the Law of Nations. Nor is the conduciveness of such an argument to judicial review open to conjecture. In the first place, it kept alive, even after the fires of revolution had cooled, the notion that the claim of law to obedience consists in its intrinsic excellence rather than its origin. Again, it made rational the notion of a hierarchy of laws in which the will of merely human legislators might on occasion be required to assume a subordinate place. Lastly, by the same token, it made rational the notion of judges pitting knowledge against sheer legislative self-assertion.

Contrariwise, the Blackstonian concept of legislative sovereignty was calculated to frustrate judicial review not only by attributing to the legislature an uncontrollable authority, but also by pressing forward the so-called "positive" conception of law and the differentiation of legal from moral obligation which this impels. Fortunately, in the notion of popular sovereignty the means of checkmating the notion of legislative sovereignty was available. For, once it became possible to attribute to the people at large a lawmaking, rather than a merely constituent, capacity, the Constitution exchanged its primary character as a statement of sacrosanct principles for that of the expressed will of the highest lawmaking power on earth.[40]

[39] See note 37, above; also Varnum's contemporary pamphlet on the case. The case was the first and last case of judicial review of the sort under the old charter.

[40] Compare in this connection Luther Martin's "Genuine Information", in Farrand's *Records*, III. 230, with Hamilton's argument for judicial review in

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But to produce judicial review, the notion of the Constitution as law must be accompanied by the principle of the finality of judicial constructions of the law, which obviously rests upon a definition of the respective rôles of "legislative" and "judicial" power in relation to the standing law. In other words, judicial review raised from the other side of the line the same problem as did "legislative interferences with the dispensation of justice"; and, in fact, it can be shown that the solution of the two problems proceeded in many jurisdictions *pari passu*.[41] The whole subject is one which demands rather ample consideration.

Although the functional differentiation of the three powers of government, first hinted in Aristotle's *Politics*,[42] necessarily preceded their organic distribution to some extent, it is not essential for our purposes to trace either process further back than to Coke's repeated insistence in his *Institutes* that "the King hath wholly left matters of Judicature according to his laws to his Judges".[43] In these words, it is not too much to say, the royal prerogative, which had long lain fallow in this respect, was thrust forever from the province of the courts. One of these same courts, on the other hand, was "the High Court of Parliament"; and Coke nowhere suggests that "the power of judicature" which he attributes to Parliament is to be distinguished from the power which Parliament ordinarily exercised in "proceeding by bill".[44] Far different is the case of Locke. His declaration that "the legislative or supreme authority cannot assume to itself a power to rule by extemporary arbitrary decrees, but is bound to dispense justice and decide the rights of the subject by promulgated standing laws and known authorized judges" represents progress towards a "material" as against a merely "formal" definition of legislative power, both in the total exclusion which it effects of the legislative body from the business of judging and also in the ideal which it lays down of statute law.[45] Noteworthy, too, from the same point of view is Montesquieu's characterization of the judges as "but the mouthpieces of the law", accompanied, as it

Federalist, no. 78, and Marshall's opinion in Marbury *v.* Madison, 1 Cranch 129. The former regards political authority as a *cessio* from the people to the government which "never devolves back to them" except in events amounting to a dissolution of government. The latter regard it as a revocable *translatio* to agents by a principal who is by no means bound to act through agents.

[41] See my "Basic Doctrine of American Constitutional Law", in *Michigan Law Review*, XII. 256, 260.

[42] Bk. IV., ch. 14.

[43] *Institutes*, IV. 70, 71; 12 *Reports* 63.

[44] *Institutes*, IV. 23, 26, 36.

[45] *Second Treatise on Civil Government*, ch. XI., sect. 136.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is, by the assertion that the mergence of "the judiciary power" with "the legislative" would render the judge "a legislator" vested with arbitrary power over the life and liberty of the subject.[46]

As usual, Blackstone's contribution is somewhat more difficult to assess. He adopts without qualification the views just quoted from Locke and Montesquieu, and he urges that "all laws should be made to commence *in futuro*". Yet the very illustration he furnishes of his definition of "municipal law" as "a rule . . . permanent, uniform, and universal" violates this precept radically, since it shows that in his estimation the *ex post facto* operation of a rule, however undesirable in itself, does not affect its title to be regarded as "law". Nor, in fact, does it occur to him, in assigning to Parliament power to "expound" the law, to distinguish those instances in which the exercise of this power would mark an intrusion upon judicial freedom of decision, while his sweeping attribution to Parliament of jurisdiction over "all mischiefs and grievances, operations and remedies that transcend the ordinary course of the laws"—a matter evidently to be judged of by Parliament itself—lands us again in the Cokian bog from which we set out.[47]

The differentiation of legislative and judicial power, upon which judicial review pivots, appears to have been immediately due, not to any definition of legislative *power*, but to a definition of judicial *duty* in relation to the standing law and especially to the law of decided cases. In the opening sentence of Bacon's Essay on Judicature one reads: "Judges ought to remember that their office is '*jus dicere*' and not '*jus dare*'; to interpret law, and not to make or give law"—words which have been reiterated many times as embodying the doctrine of *stare decisis*.[48] Coke employs different language, but his thought is not essentially different: "judges discern by law what is just"; the law is "the golden metwand whereby all men's causes are justly and evenly measured". He also notes the artificiality of the law's "reason and judgment", and pays full tribute to the burden of study and experience "before that a man can attain to the cognizance of it".[49] Judicial duty is thus matched with judicial aptitude—the judges are the experts of the law—or, in the words of Blackstone, its "living oracles", sworn to determine, not according to their own private judgment, "but according to the known laws and

[46] *Spirit of Laws* (trans. Pritchard), bk. XI., ch. 6.

[47] *Commentaries*, I. 44, 46, 58, 160–161, 267, 269.

[48] Broom, *Maxims* (fifth American ed.), p. 105 and citations; pp. 140–141 of the original edition.

[49] See note 43, *supra*.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

customs of the land; not delegated to pronounce a new law, but to maintain and expound the old one".[50]

In brief, it is the duty of judges to conserve the law, not to change it, a task for which their learning pre-eminently fits them. Yet a mystery remains to clear up; for how came this *duty* of subordination to the law to be transmuted into a claim of exclusive *power* in relation to it—the power of interpreting it with final force and effect? By the doctrine of the separation of powers, the outstanding prerogatives of each department are no doubt its peculiar possession; but still that does not explain why in the final apportionment of territory between the legislative and judicial departments in the United States, the function of law-interpretation fell to the latter. The fact is that we here confront *the* act of creation—or perhaps it would be better to say, act of prestidigitation—attending the elaboration of the doctrine of judicial review; and what is more, we know the authors of it—or some of them.

In his argument in the case of Trevett *v.* Weeden, Varnum put the question: "Have the judges a power to repeal, to amend, to alter, or to make new laws?" and then proceeded to answer it thus: "God forbid! In that case they would be legislators. . . . But the judiciary have the sole power of judging of laws . . . and can not admit any act of the legislatures as law against the Constitution." And to the same effect is the defense which James Iredell penned of the North Carolina supreme court's decision in Bayard *v.* Singleton,[51] while Davie, his associate in the case, was in attendance upon the Convention at Philadelphia.

> The duty of that [the judicial] department [he wrote] I conceive in all cases is to decide according to the laws of the State. It will not be denied, I suppose, that the constitution is a law of the State, as well as an act of Assembly, with this difference only, that it is the *fundamental* law, and unalterable by the legislature, which derives all its power from it. . . . The judges, therefore, must take care at their peril, that every act of Assembly they presume to enforce is warranted by the constitution, since if it is not, they act without lawful authority.

Nor is this a power which may be exercised by ministerial officers, "for if the power of judging rests with the courts their decision is final".[52]

Here are all the premises of the doctrine of judicial review either explicitly stated or clearly implied: the superiority of the Constitution to statute law—the case of the common law had still to be dealt with; its quality as law knowable by judges in their official capacity

[50] *Commentaries*, I. 69–71.

[51] 1 Martin 42.

[52] McRee, *Life and Correspondence of Iredell*, II. 145–149.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and applicable by them to cases; the exclusion of "legislative power" from the ancient field of parliamentary power in law-interpretation, except in circumstances in which the law is subject to legislative amendment. The classical version of the doctrine of judicial review in *Federalist*, number 78, improves upon the statement of these premises but adds nothing essential to them.

IV.

We turn now to that phase of the problem which confronted the Philadelphia Convention in consequence of the insufficiencies of the government established by the Articles of Confederation. And at the outset let it be remarked that with all their defects, and serious as these were, the Articles none the less performed two services of great moment: they kept the idea of union vital during the period when the feeling of national unity was at its lowest ebb; and they accorded formal recognition that the great powers of war and foreign relations were intrinsically national in character. Those two most dramatic and interesting functions belonged to the general government from the first and became the central magnet to which other powers necessarily gravitated.

The essential defect of the Articles of Confederation, as has been so often pointed out,[53] consisted in the fact that the government established by them operated not upon the individual citizens of the United States but upon the states in their corporate capacity—that, in brief, it was not a government at all, but rather the central agency of an alliance. As a consequence, on the one hand, even the powers theoretically belonging to the Congress of the Confederation were practically unenforceable; while, on the other hand, the theoretical scope of its authority was unduly narrow. Inasmuch as taxes are collectible from individuals, Congress could not levy them; inasmuch as commerce is an affair of individuals, Congress could not regulate it; and its treaties had not at first the force of laws, since to have given them that operation would again have been to impinge upon individuals directly and not through the mediation of the state legislatures. Furthermore, the powers withheld from Congress remained with the states—which is to say, *with their legislatures*. The evil thence resulting was thus a double one. Not only was a common policy impracticable in fields where it was most evidently necessary, but also the local legislatures had it in their power to embroil both the country as a whole with foreign nations and its constituent parts with each other. So the weakness of the Confederation played di-

[53] See especially *Federalist*, no. 15.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rectly into the hands of the chief defect of government within the states themselves—an excessive concentration of power in the hands of the legislative department.

The endeavors which were made to render the Articles of Confederation a workable instrument of government proceeded, naturally, along the two lines of amendment and construction. In theory the Articles were amendable; but owing to the requirement that amendments had to be ratified by all the states, in practice they were not so.[54] Recourse, therefore, had early to be had to the other method, and eventually with fruitful results.

Yet the possibilities of constitutional construction, too, were at the outset seriously curtailed by the transmutation of the Blackstonian teaching into the dogma of state sovereignty.[55] Fortunately, the notion of American nationality, which the early fervors of the Revolution had evoked into something like articulate expression, did not altogether lack a supporting interest. This consisted in the determination of the states with definite western boundaries to convert the territory between the Alleghenies and the Mississippi into a national domain. Their spokesman accordingly advanced the argument that the royal title to this region had devolved, in consequence of the Revolution, not upon the states with "sea-to-sea" charters, but upon the American people as a whole[56]—a premise of infinite possibilities, as soon appeared.

On the very last day of 1781 Congress passed the act incorporating the Bank of North America. Not only was there no clause of the Articles which authorized Congress to create corporations, but the second article specifically stipulated that "each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by the Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled". Quite naturally, the validity of the charter was challenged, whereupon its defense was undertaken by James Wilson. The article just quoted Wilson swept aside at the outset as entirely irrelevant to the question. Inasmuch, said he, as no state could claim or exercise "any power or act of sovereignty extending over all the other States or any of them", it followed that the power to "incorporate a bank commensurate to the

[54] McLaughlin, *op. cit.*, ch. XI.

[55] Van Tyne, "Sovereignty in the American Revolution", in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XII. 529 ff.

[56] *Journals of the Continental Congress*, ed. Hunt, XVIII. 936–937; Wharton, *Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence*, V. 88–89; New York Historical Society, *Collections*, 1878, pp. 138–139; J. C. Welling in Am. Hist. Assoc., *Papers*, III. 167 ff.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States" was "not an act of sovereignty or a power . . . which by the second Article . . . must be expressly delegated to Congress in order to be possessed by that body". Congress's power, in fact, rested on other premises.

> To many purposes [he continued] the United States are to be considered as one undivided nation; and as possessed of all the rights and powers, and properties by the law of nations incident to such. Whenever an object occurs to the direction of which no particular state is competent, the management of it must of necessity belong to the United States in Congress assembled.[57]

In short, from the very fact of its exercise on a national scale a power ceased to be one claimable by a state. The reflection is suggested that if the Articles of Confederation had continued subject to this canon of construction, they might easily have come to support an even greater structure of derived powers than the Constitution of the United States does at this moment.

The question, however, upon which the permanently fruitful efforts of constitutional construction were at this time brought to bear was that of treaty enforcement; and while the story is not a new one, its full significance seems not to have been altogether appreciated. The starting-point is furnished by the complaints which the British government began lodging with Congress very shortly after the making of the peace treaty that the state legislatures were putting impediments in the way of British creditors and were renewing confiscations of Loyalist property contrary to Articles IV. and VI., respectively, of the treaty.[58]

Now it should be observed that the immediate beneficiaries of these articles were certain classes of *private persons,* whose claims, moreover, were such as would ordinarily have to be asserted against other individuals *in court.* If, therefore, it could only be assured that the state courts would accord such claims proper recognition and enforcement, the obligation of the United States as a government, under the treaty, would be performed and the complaints of the other party to the treaty must thereupon cease. But how could this be assured? The answer was suggested by the current vague connotation of the word "law" and the current endeavor to find in "judicial power" a check upon legislative power in the states.

Nor can there be any doubt as to who first formulated this solution. It was Alexander Hamilton in his argument before a municipal court in New York City in the case of Rutgers *v.* Waddington in 1784, practically contemporaneously with the British protests

[57] *Works of James Wilson,* ed. J. D. Andrews, I. 558 ff.

[58] MacDonald, *Documentary Source Book,* pp. 207–208.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

above referred to.[59] The case involved a recent enactment of the state legislature creating a right of action for trespass against Tory occupants of premises in favor of owners who had fled the city during the British possession. In his capacity as Waddington's attorney, Hamilton assailed the act as contrary to principles of the law of nations, to the treaty of peace, which he asserted implied an amnesty, and the Articles of Confederation, and as, therefore, void. Only the manuscript notes of his argument are extant, but these sufficiently indicate its bearing for our purpose:

> Congress have made a treaty [they read in part]. A breach of that would be a breach of their constitutional authority. . . . as well a County may alter the laws of the State as the State those of the Confederation. . . . While Confed. exists its cons. Autho. paramount. But how are Judges to decide? Ans.: Cons. giving Jud. Power only in prize causes in all others Judges of each State must of necessity be judges of United States. And the law of each State must adopt the laws of Congress. Though in relation to its own Citizens local laws might govern, yet in relation to foreigners those of United States must prevail. It must be conceded Leg. of one State cannot repeal law of United States. All must be construed to Stand together.[60]

There is a striking parallel between the cases of Rutgers *v.* Waddington and Trevett *v.* Weeden, and especially between the subsequent fate of Hamilton's argument in the one and Varnum's in the other. In each case the court concerned decided adversely to the party relying upon the statute before it, but did so on grounds which avoided its committing itself on the issue of judicial review. In each case, nevertheless, the exponents of Blackstonian absolutism raised loud protests in behalf of the threatened legislative authority, with the result of spreading the impression that the judges had met the issue squarely. Yet since what the judges had said hardly bore out this impression, interested attention was naturally directed in turn to the franker and more extensive claims of counsel; and while Varnum was spreading his argument broadcast as a pamphlet, Hamilton was reiterating his views in his "Letters from Phocion".[61]

Of the various repercussions from Hamilton's argument in Rutgers *v.* Waddington the most important is the report which John Jay—a fellow New Yorker—rendered to Congress as secretary for

[59] See H. B. Dawson's pamphlet on the case; also Coxe's and Haines's well-known volumes. Hamilton had the year previous been a member of a committee of Congress which had the subject of violations of the treaty of peace under consideration. For the report of this committee, see *Journals of the American Congress* (Washington, 1823), IV. 224–225.

[60] Allan McLane Hamilton, *Intimate Life of Alexander Hamilton*, pp. 457, 460–461. "Our sovereignty began by a Federal act", he asserts (p. 459).

[61] See *Works*, Constitutional ed., IV. 238–240.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreign affairs, in October, 1786, on the subject of state violations of treaties. The salient passage of this document reads as follows:

> Your secretary considers the thirteen independent sovereign states as having, by express delegation of power, formed and vested in Congress a perfect though limited sovereignty for the general and national purposes specified in the confederation. In this sovereignty they cannot severally participate (except by their delegates) or have concurrent jurisdiction. . . . When therefore a treaty is constitutionally made, ratified and published by Congress, it immediately becomes binding on the whole nation, and superadded to the laws of the land, without the intervention, consent or fiat of state legislatures.

It was therefore, Jay argued, the duty of the state judiciaries in cases between private individuals "respecting the meaning of a treaty", to give it full enforcement in harmony with "the rules and maxims established by the laws of nations for the interpretation of treaties". He accordingly recommended that Congress formally deny the right of the state legislatures to enact laws construing "a national treaty" or impeding its operation "in any manner", that it avow its opinion that all acts on the statute books repugnant to the treaty of peace should be at once repealed, and that it urge the repeal to be in general terms which would leave it with the local judiciaries to decide all cases arising under the treaty according to the intent thereof "anything in the said acts . . . to the contrary notwithstanding".[62]

The following March Congress adopted the resolutions which Jay had proposed, without a dissenting vote, and in April, within a month of the date set for the assembling of the Philadelphia Convention, transmitted them to the state legislatures, by the majority of which they were promptly complied with.[63] Nor is the theory on which such repeals were based doubtful. We find it stated in the declaration of the North Carolina supreme court in the above-mentioned case of Bayard *v.* Singleton, which was decided the very month that the Convention came together, that "the Articles of Confederation are a part of the law of the land unrepealable by any act of the general assembly".

From all this to Article VI. of the Constitution is manifestly only a step, though an important one. The supremacy which Jay's plan assured the national treaties is in Article VI. but part and parcel of national supremacy in all its phases; but this broader supremacy is still guaranteed by being brought to bear upon individuals, in contrast to states, through the intervention in the first instance often of

[62] *Secret Journals of Congress* (Boston, 1821), IV. 185–287.

[63] Jefferson's letter of May 29, 1792, to the British minister Hammond, gives all the facts. *Writings,* Memorial ed., XVI. 183–277.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the state courts. Thus the solution provided of the question of treaty enforcement, whereby the cause of national supremacy was linked with that of judicial review, clearly foreshadowed the ultimate character of the national government as a government acting upon individuals in the main rather than upon the states. Logically, national power operative through courts is a deduction from a government over individuals; chronologically, the order of ideas was the reverse.

V.

The theory that the Articles of Confederation were for some purposes law, directly cognizable by courts, entirely transformed the character of the Confederation so far forth, and must sooner or later have suggested the idea of its entire transformation into a real government. Nor was judicial review the only possible source of such a suggestion. As Madison points out in the *Federalist*, "in cases of capture; of piracy; of the post-office; of coins, weights, and measures; of trade with the Indians; of claims under grants of land by different States; and, above all, in the case of trials by courts-martial in the army and navy", the government of the Confederation acted immediately on individuals from the first.[64] Again, proposals which were laid at various times before the states for conferring a customs revenue on Congress, though none was ever finally ratified, served to bring the same idea before the people, as also did the proposals which never reached the states from Congress to endow the latter with "the sole and exclusive" power over foreign and interstate trade.[65]

But even earlier the suggestion of a "continental conference" for the purpose of framing a "Continental Charter" akin to Magna Carta had been propounded in that famous issue of *Common Sense* in which the signal was given for independence itself. It would be the task of such a body, wrote Paine, to fix "the number and manner of choosing members of Congress and members of assembly", and to draw "the line of business and jurisdiction between them (always remembering that our strength is continental and not provincial)". Such a charter would also secure "freedom and property to all men", and indeed, would fill the place of monarchy itself in the new state. "That we may not appear to be defective even in earthly honors, let a day be solemnly set apart for proclaiming the charter; let it be brought forth placed on the divine law, the word of God; let a crown be placed thereon, by which the world may know that so far we approve monarchy that in America the law is King."[66]

[64] *Federalist*, no. 40.

[65] D. W. Brown, *op. cit.*, ch. II.

[66] *Political Writings of Thomas Paine* (1835), I. 45–46.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this singular mixture of sense and fantasy, so characteristic of its author, are adumbrated a national constitutional convention, the dual plan of our federal system, a national bill of rights, and "worship of the Constitution"; and this was some months before the earliest state constitution and nearly four years before Hamilton's proposal, in his letter to Duane of September 3, 1780, of "a solid, coercive Union".[67]

But the great essential precursor to the success of all such proposals was the consolidation of a sufficient interest transcending state lines, and this was slow in forming. It was eventually brought about in three ways: first, through the abuse by the states of their powers over commerce; secondly, through the rise of the question—in which Washington was especially interested—of opening up communications with the West; thirdly, on account of the sharp fear which was aroused among property owners everywhere by the Shays Rebellion. The last was the really decisive factor. The call for a constitutional convention which had emanated from Annapolis in the autumn of 1786 was heeded by only three states, Virginia, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and was ignored by Congress; but the call which Congress itself issued in the following February under the stimulus imparted by the uprising in Massachusetts was responded to by nine states in due course—New Hampshire being the last on account of the late date of the assembling of its legislature.[68] Testimony from private sources is to the same effect; it shows how the Massachusetts uprising completed the work of the paper-money craze in convincing men that constitutional reform had ceased to be a merely local problem.[69]

In this connection a paper prepared by Madison in April, 1787, and entitled "Vices of the Political System of the United States",[70] becomes of great interest both for its content and because of the leading part later taken by its author in the work of the Convention. The title itself is significant: "the Political System of the United States" is *one,* and therefore the problem of its reform in all its branches is a single problem; and the argument itself bears out this prognosis. The defects of the Confederation are first considered: the failure of the states to comply with the requisitions of Congress, their encroachments on the central authority, their violations of the treaties of the United States and the Law of Nations, their trespasses on the rights of each other, their want of concert in matters

[67] *Works,* Constitutional ed., I. 213.

[68] See the credentials, Elliot's *Debates,* second ed., I. 159 ff.

[69] Beveridge, *Life of John Marshall,* vol. I., ch. 8.

[70] *Writings,* ed. Hunt, II. 361 ff.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of common interest, the lack of a coercive power in the government of the Confederation, the lack of a popular ratification of the Articles —all these are noted. Then in the midst of this catalogue appears a hitherto unheard-of specification: "want of guaranty to the States of their constitutions and laws against internal violence"—an obvious deduction from the Shays Rebellion.

It is, however, for the legislative evils which he finds within the states individually that Madison reserves his strongest words of condemnation. "As far as laws are necessary", he writes, "to mark with precision the duties of those who are to obey them, and to take from those who are to administer them a discretion which might be abused, their number is the price of liberty. As far as laws exceed this limit, they are a nuisance; a nuisance of the most pestilent kind." Yet "try the Codes of the several States by this test, and what a luxuriancy of legislation do they present. The short period of independency has filled as many pages as the century which preceded it". Nor was this multiplicity of laws the greatest evil—worse was their mutability, a clear mark "of vicious legislation"; and worst of all their injustice, which brought "into question the fundamental principle of republican Government, that the majority who rule in such governments are the safest Guardians both of public Good and private rights".

Indeed Madison proceeded to argue, in effect, that majority rule was more or less of a superstition. No doubt the evils just recounted were traceable in part to the individual selfishness of the representatives of the people; but their chief cause lay in a much more stubborn fact—the natural arrangement of society.

> All civilized societies [he wrote] are divided into different interests and factions, as they happen to be creditors or debtors—rich or poor—husbandmen, merchants or manufacturers—members of different religious sects—followers of different political leaders—inhabitants of different districts—owners of different kinds of property, etc., etc. In republican Government the majority however composed, ultimately give the law. Whenever therefore an apparent interest or common passion unites a majority what is to restrain them from unjust violations of the rights and interests of the minority, or of individuals?

Merely moral or persuasive remedies Madison found to be useless when addressed to political selfishness—which itself never lacks a moral excuse—nor does he once refer to the teachings of Montesquieu, for the reason, it may be surmised, that the model constitution of the Union by this test had broken down at the very moment of crisis. One device, nevertheless, remained untried: the enlargement of the geographical sphere of government. For the advan-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tage of a large republic over a small one, Madison insisted, was this: owing, on the one hand, to the greater variety of interests scattered through it, and, on the other, to the natural barrier of distance, a dangerous coalescence of factions became much more difficult. "As a limited monarchy tempers the evils of an absolute one; so an extensive Republic meliorates the administration of a small Republic."

And how precisely was this remedy to be applied in the case of the United States? In the paper before us, Madison seems to imply the belief that the states ought to surrender all their powers to the national government, but his letters make it plain that this was not his programme. Rather, the powers of the central government should be greatly enlarged, and it should be converted into a real government, operative upon individuals and vested with all the coercive powers of government; then this enlarged and strengthened government, which on account of the territorial extent of its constituency would with difficulty fall a prey to faction, should be set as a check upon the exercise by the state governments of the considerable powers which must still remain with them. "The national government" must "have a negative in all cases whatsoever on the legislative acts of the states", he wrote, like that of the King in colonial days. This was "the least possible abridgment of the State sovereignties". "The happy effect" of such an arrangement would be "its control on the internal vicissitudes of State policy and the aggressions of interested majorities on the rights of minorities and individuals". Thus was the Balance of Power, which Montesquieu had borrowed from the stock teachings of the eighteenth-century diplomacy, to transform it into a maxim of free constitutions, projected into the midway field of federal government.

Every constitutional system gives rise, in relation to the interests of the people whom it is designed to serve, to certain characteristic and persistent problems. The most persistent problem of the American constitutional system arises from the fact that to a multitude of state legislatures are assigned many of the most important powers of government over the individual. Originally, indeed, the bias in favor of local autonomy so overweighted the American constitutional system in that direction that it broke down entirely, both within the states, where the basic rights of property and contract were seriously infringed, and throughout the nation at large, because from the central government essential powers had been withheld.

In the solution of the problems thence resulting, four important constructive ideas were successively brought forward in the years

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

immediately preceding the Philadelphia Convention, all of them reflecting the doctrine of the separation of powers or the attendant notion of a check and balance in government. The abuses resulting from the hitherto undifferentiated character of "legislative power" were met by the idea that it was something intrinsically distinct from "judicial power", and that therefore it was exceeded when it interfered with the dispensation of justice through the ordinary courts. Then building upon this result, the finality of judicial determinations was represented as extending to the interpretation of the standing law, a proposition which, when brought into association with the notion of a higher law, yielded the initial form of the doctrine of judicial review. Meantime, the idea was being advanced that the Articles of Confederation were, in relation to acts of the local legislatures, just such a higher law, thus suggesting a sanction for the acts of the Confederation which in principle entirely transformed its character. Finally, from Madison, who from the first interested himself in every phase of the rising movement for constitutional reform both in his own state and the country at large, came the idea that the problem of providing adequate safeguards for private rights and adequate powers for a national government was one and the same problem, inasmuch as a strengthened national government could be made a make-weight against the swollen prerogatives of the state legislatures. It remained for the Constitutional Convention, however, while it accepted Madison's main idea, to apply it through the agency of judicial review. Nor can it be doubted that this determination was assisted by a growing comprehension in the Convention of the *doctrine* of judicial review.[71]

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

[71] *Cf.* Farrand, II. 73–80; and *Federalist*, no. 78.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

An Early Plan for the Development of the West

Despite the marked attention which has been devoted by investigators to the development of the American West, it would appear that the history of speculative ideas in regard to the colonization and government of that region has been to some extent neglected, in comparison with the story of its actual settlement. In this connection it may be pertinent to mention a plan of unusual interest, apparently overlooked hitherto, which appeared in London in 1775 as a part of the voluminous controversial literature called into being by the dispute between England and her colonies, and which in several important aspects bears a striking resemblance to the territorial policy later adopted by the United States.

The author was John Cartwright, who in later life became well known as the "father" of parliamentary reform. Together with Granville Sharp, Richard Price, and Joseph Priestley, he belonged to that small group of advanced English thinkers who denied that the British Parliament had any jurisdiction whatever over the American possessions of the crown—in fact, his unorthodox opinions in this respect led him shortly afterwards to decline to serve under Admiral Howe against the American revolutionists, although his refusal involved the deliberate sacrifice of a naval career. In 1774 Cartwright had published, first separately and then in collected form under the title *American Independence the Interest and Glory of Great Britain,* a series of letters in which he had taken the position that the colonies were connected with England solely through their co-ordinate position with her under the British crown, and not because of any dependent or inferior constitutional status. The following year he brought out a second edition of the work, which contained several additional portions, including a so-called "Postscript" dated April, 1775. It was in this "Postscript" that Cartwright outlined his ideas in regard to trans-Appalachian America.

He took up the subject, as it were, parenthetically, after first proposing the text of an act of Parliament which he claimed would, if passed, provide a speedy solution of the whole American problem. Parliament was by this act expressly to renounce any pretensions it might have had to sovereignty over the colonies and was to recognize the colonial legislatures as co-ordinate with itself. The colonies,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eighteen in number (including the Floridas, St. Johns Island, and Quebec as bounded in 1763), were "all and each of them to be henceforth held to be free and independent states", of which "his Majesty" was stipulated to be "the true and lawful sovereign head". Thus constituted, the empire was to become "the Grand British League and Confederacy", of which Great Britain, on account of her pre-eminent naval power, was to be the "common maritime protector and umpire", but which nevertheless was in theory to be held together only by treaty and the bond of a common crown.

Then, in his explanatory remarks following his proposed bill, Cartwright extended his scheme to embrace the whole of British America. He declared that the loose imperial "league" which he contemplated should by no means be confined to the colonies already existing. Instead, those which claimed vast lands beyond the mountains were to be reduced to more moderate dimensions, and all the country between them and the Mississippi was to be parcelled out by the league into definite tracts of territory which ultimately were to become free and independent states and fellow-members of the confederacy.

Cartwright thus had in mind a comprehensive imperial scheme, significant in connection with the later development of both the British Empire and the United States. The weak union which he proposed, being solely in the crown, bore in fact though not in theory a close resemblance to the modern British "Commonwealth of Nations"; indeed, Cartwright repeatedly used the term "nations" in referring to the member-states of his confederacy. And the fact that he definitely advocated a confederacy, however weak—one, moreover, which by partitioning the transmontane wilderness was to create for itself new prospective members—makes his plan likewise a forerunner of developments within the American republic.

The striking nature of Cartwright's entire programme is largely due to the fact that, unlike many of his contemporaries, he did not content himself with broad generalizations, but worked out every feature of his scheme in the most painstaking detail. His proposal for the disposition of the back country was in this respect particularly noteworthy. It constituted nothing less than an elaborate plan for the erection in that region of nineteen additional states, to each of which he assigned precise boundaries and even a specific name.

Not only was this ambitious project thoroughly described in the text of his work, but it was also depicted graphically by a comprehensive and well-executed map which he inserted as a frontispiece. In its general features this map bore a close resemblance to that en-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

graved in 1769 for insertion in Captain John Knox's *Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America for the Years 1757, 1758, 1759, and 1760,* by the cartographer Thomas Kitchin. Cartwright may therefore possibly have secured his general outline by copying the map of Kitchin, afterwards inserting his own inter-colonial boundaries. This supposition appears all the more probable in view of the fact that, although American geographical names had not yet become crystallized and showed considerable diversity of form and spelling in the various maps of the period, those used by Cartwright coincided with those of Kitchin in nearly every instance. A reproduction of Cartwright's map accompanies this article.

The most characteristic feature of Cartwright's arrangement of the states provided for in his plan was undoubtedly his utilization of navigable waterways as primary frontiers, along which all of the new divisions were to be laid out. In this manner he provided that they should each have free access to ocean-borne navigation, while no one of them would ever be able, by possessing both river banks at a single point, to prevent the passage of shipping. Furthermore—and here, in the interest of "the harmony of the whole", Cartwright recognized an important practical restriction upon these theoretically independent units—each state, by having an exposed water frontier, would be subject to effective control by the British navy. Apparently, therefore, his early naval training had given him a clear comprehension of the cardinal principles of sea power.

Another of Cartwright's ideas which, in the light of later developments, appears highly suggestive, is that of fixing a definite minimum population as a prerequisite for statehood. Each of his territorial divisions was to remain directly subject to the government of Great Britain until such time as it should contain fifty thousand inhabitants, but as soon as this number had been reached, was to take its place beside its sister-states as a free and independent member of the confederacy. The similarity to the corresponding portions of the ordinances of 1784 and 1787 is at once manifest.

The possibility that Cartwright's ideas may have exerted some influence, direct or indirect, upon the formation of American territorial policy offers a fascinating field for speculation. Could his proposal to limit the seaboard colonies at the mountains and to form new states beyond have been in any way connected with Maryland's notable stand in the Continental Congress a few years later upon the question of the western land claims? It would be especially interesting to know whether Thomas Jefferson, the reputed author of the Ordinance of 1784, had ever chanced upon Cartwright's plan of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1775. Jefferson's arbitrary method of laying out states rectangularly by means of latitude and longitude contrasts sharply indeed with the sea-trained Cartwright's more statesmanlike system of using waterways as boundaries, and the new state names proposed by Jefferson seem to have been little influenced by those of Cartwright, although like them derived mainly from physical features of the neighborhood. But in other respects the projects of the two men seem to have had much in common. Cartwright advocated the division of the whole country in advance of settlement, by the "grand confederacy", into units of moderate size, which were in time to become states equal in juridical status to those already existing; and he made the achievement of independent statehood contingent in each case upon the attaining of a certain minimum population. These ideas occur as fundamental bases of the Ordinance of 1784. It seems, therefore, that the policy adopted by the United States of enlarging the federal union by the admission of new members created from territory hitherto dependent—that epochal policy which so successfully solved the political problem caused by the rapid settlement of the western wilderness—might conceivably have had Cartwright's plan as one of its sources.

The text of the portion of the "Postscript"[1] which contains the project for new western states follows.

HAROLD M. BAER.

And for the more effectually preserving the future balance of power between all the states of that immense continent, might it not be expedient that the limits and boundaries of each, which they should never hereafter pass, should be newly defined by the Grand British League and Confederacy; and some of their nominal interior boundaries now lying very far within the wilderness, be changed for others at a nearer distance? For the same good purpose and other apparent good reasons, might not the remainder of the wilderness be partitioned out into certain determinate and limited tracts, according to soil and situation; each of which should be considered as the territory of some future state which in process of time might be therein erected? And I would propose that no interruption should be given to the growing of such new states (other than every government has a right to give by wholesome laws within itself to prevent as much as may be a spirit or practice of emigration); but that until the settlers within any such partitioned tract of the wilderness should be increased and multiplied to the number of fifty thousand souls, they should be considered as incapable of forming an independent political state, and be subject for the intermediate time to the government of Great-Britain. But as soon as their numbers should amount to fifty thousands souls as aforesaid, they should be entitled and free to erect themselves into an independent political state, and to constitute for their own government such a legislative power as they should judge most

[1] Pp. 42–48.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proper; provided only that they acknowledged the king of Great-Britain as their lawful sovereign, that they made the protestant faith the established religion of the country, and consented to become a party to the Grand British League and Confederacy.

During the short space of time indeed that remains of that winter's day to the evening of which we may hope to continue the despotic lords of North America, those immense divisions of country we have affected to make by our charters and by act of parliament on a late memorable occasion, may, like all other arbitrary compendiums, be *convenient to us,* so long as we determine to continue arbitrary rulers; or it might hereafter be favourable to the ambition of some one American state hungering to swallow up its neighbours, to have its territory like that of the ambitious Catherine reaching from the salt ocean to the fresh-water seas in midland, and thence to the salt ocean again quite across the vast continent; but in neither case would it be desirable or good for *the people of those countries.* Nations are most free and happy when their extremities are near enough to the vital seat of government to feel its pervading principle in its full warmth and activity, and by the spring of their own re-action to pour into the heart again full-flowing tides of health, life and vigour. On these principles I should wish to see the North American states arranged back to back like habitations in a well-built city, leaving those yet to rise into being to front the lakes and great rivers St. Lawrence and Mississippi, as the present ones do the Atlantic sea. We have already enumerated in the foregoing draught for an act of parliament eighteen states already formed; and by such a division of the remaining country by the grand confederacy as we have proposed, provision might be made for the future gradual and quiet establishment of nineteen more at least, all of ample extent, and every one having a very considerable frontier accessible to shipping and upon waters which are at this time navigated by the British navy. Thus each of these numerous states, by the same means that would enable it through commerce to become a respectable member of the grand British confederacy, would be effectually subject to the controul and influence of Great-Britain their common maritime protector and umpire, so necessary for preserving the harmony of the whole. According to this system no state adjoining to the two great rivers should possess the shores on both sides; as navigations of such magnitude and importance should be always boundaries and frontier. The reasons are obvious.

If we cast our eyes over an American map, and view attentively the singular distribution of land and water, and the directions of the two capital rivers; and if we then consider what hath already taken place in the establishment of a long range of narrow-fronted states along the sea-coast throughout its whole extent; we shall possibly be led to conclude that the plan we recommend is the plain suggestion of Providence, who from the first hath hitherto wrought according to it himself, and seems to have made its future observance and completion an obvious dictate of nature to all parties concerned, but most so to Great-Britain. In order to illustrate what I have said to this effect, let me just mention such alterations of boundaries and trace out such districts of future dominion as strike my own eye, and carry an appearance of equality and propriety well adapted to the nature of the supposed confederacy so far as they can be judged of by the map; this being sufficient for all present purposes; that is for those of explanation.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To begin then with Quebec, I should not content myself with reducing it to the same size as before its late enormous extension; but I would propose that it should be bounded to the N.E. at the river Saguenay, and to the S.W. by the river Atawas: it would then have a maritime frontier of two hundred miles. And making the lakes of St. John, St. Peter, Beauharnois, Abitibis and Temiscaming its respective interior limits westward and northward, it would be about 360 miles in length. There would then be left a country of about equal surface, though with a larger frontier to the water, between Quebec and Labrador, which latter commences at the river St. John in the gulph of St. Lawrence, as one of those districts to be appointed as above-mentioned for the seat of a future nation. This country for the present by way of distinction may be called Tadousacaia, after the name of one of its ancient tribes of Indians. Montreal might be the capital of another state which should extend from that city and the aforesaid river Atawas up the river St. Lawrence and Catarakui as far as Lake Ontario; the chain of streams and small lakes lying between Fort Frontenac and the east end of Lake Huron being its limit to the S.W.; Lake Huron itself from the little Lake Huron to French River its western confine; and Lake Nipissin together with River Atawas its boundary to the north. The ancient Huronia having Montreal to the N.E. and for the rest completely incircled by the waters of the Ontario, the Oswego and Huron Lakes, is by nature formed into another territory. The next will extend along the whole north shore of Lake Huron from French River to the falls of St. Mary, and bordering on Montreal and Quebec might retain the appellation of Canada. The shores of Lake Superior will furnish ample frontier to four states more. The first, or Mensisipia, beginning at the aforesaid falls of St. Mary and terminating at the river which forms the discharge of Lake Alemipigon; the second, or Camanestigonia, at Long Lake which receives the overflowings of the Lake of the Woods; the third, or Missisagania, at the Bay of St. Charles; and the fourth, or Puania, will pass the strait and reach as far as the River Outagamis at the bottom of the Bay of Puans. The two latter will also have other navigable frontiers on the Mississippi; Missisagania being watered by that river from the rivulet of Ouabaougetan to the falls of St. Anthony, and Puania from the said falls to the river Ouisconsin. Then again Mascoutenia, having the Mississippi to the S.W. from the River Ouisconsin to the Illinois river, might also have a maritime frontier from the bottom of the Bay of Puans above-mentioned to the River St. Joseph at the south-end of Lake Michigan; while Miamisia like Huronia would be washed by the waters of three lakes, Michigan, Huron and Erie as far as the river Miamis. The south shores of Lake Erie or Oswego, and as they incline N.E. until they reach Ochureni, might be allotted to Erieland; from thence to Oswego Fort and Bay in Lake Ontario, to Senekania; and Catarakua might take in the rest of the lake, all the river Catarakui N.E. to La Prairie, then turning south again all Richlieu river and the west shore of Lake Champlain as far as Crown Point. The east shore of this lake and the said river Richlieu, together with the south-east shore of the St. Lawrence as far as Wolf River opposite the Saguenay, would belong to Champlania; and the remainder of the river St. Lawrence together with the coast of the gulph as far as the river Ristigouchi in Miramichi Bay, (which I would also propose for the confine of Nova-Scotia), would give a very extensive maritime frontier to Gas-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pesia. Again, we shall find still remaining upon the Mississippi below the river Illinois, which we made the southern boundary of Mascoutenia, sufficient frontier for three extensive territories: the first, or Wauwautania, reaching as far as the Ohio; and the other two, Chicasawria and Chactawria divided into equal districts, will bring us to the present boundary of West Florida lying in 31° of north latitude. And it might not be amiss perhaps to set apart the Province of Sagadahock from New England and make it an independent state.

From the point of confluence between the waters of the Great Miomee with those of the Ohio, as a center, might diverge several lines of interior separation, thus;—Suppose one line to run due south till it should intersect the northern limit of East Florida; this would divide all the lower nations on the Mississippi from Virginia and the southern colonies fronting the Atlantic. A second line from the same point north-westward to the junction of the two rivers Illinois and Theakiki called the Fork, would separate Wauwautania and Miamisia. A third in the direction of the courses of the Great Miomee and Miamis rivers, would divide Miamisia from Erieland. And a fourth being formed by the winding course of the Ohio itself as high as the site of the late fort called Du Quesne would separate Virginia and Pennsylvania from Erieland. Then a new division line might begin at the said site of fort Du Quesne, and leaving the Ohio to the westward, and passing along the Allegany Mountains, might take a pretty strait course to Lake George, and thence to the south end of Lake Champlain; thence again N.E. to the northern bend of the river St. John on the present confines of New England and Nova Scotia; forming the interior confine of all the northern colonies on the Atlantic to that point, as well as of the above-mentioned districts bordering on Lake Ontario, the Catarakui and St. Lawrence. Then a line from Ochureni to Du Quesne would part Erieland from Senekania. A line also from the Bay of Oswego on Lake Ontario that should intersect at the nearest point the grand division line running N.E. and S.W. would separate Senekania from Catarakua. And another line to come from Wolfe River which empties itself into the St. Lawrence opposite the river Saguenay to the termination of the last-mentioned one at the said bend of the river St. John, and thence falling into the river Ristigouchi which hath its discharge into the gulph at the Bay of Miramichi, would bound Gaspesia towards Nova Scotia, Sagadahock and Champlain, and complete the general sketch of our proposed divisions.

Thus, as I have said before, to the eighteen states already enumerated, we might by a prudent foresight cause all future additions to the number to be so made as that none should be too large or too small, all having an ample surface and an extensive maritime frontier, and being thereby every way calculated for being hereafter joined with the rest of the free and independent states in the grand British confederacy.

Disfranchisement of Negroes in New England

An examination of the works touching upon this topic has revealed the fact that the information contained in them is curiously inadequate and misleading. No book or article has been found that gives the facts correctly, and it may be well, therefore, to summarize

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them as found in a brief examination of the original sources. It may be stated at once that the negro was disfranchised not only in Connecticut but also in Rhode Island, although not elsewhere in New England.

Without wishing to appear critical of the work of others, for the writer is only too well aware of the fatal facility with which errors can creep in, the inaccuracies of some of the works dealing with the subject may be noted. In one of the earliest American works on suffrage, Samuel Jones stated that only *white* males could vote in Connecticut but that there had been no change in the suffrage qualifications in Rhode Island since before the Revolution.[1] A. M. Mowry, in his article on "The Constitutional Controversy in Rhode Island in 1841", spoke of the "suffrage, as finally determined by the Assembly in 1798", leaving the reader to infer that there had been no change between that "final determination" and the period of which he was writing.[2] S. B. Weeks included Rhode Island among the states that had "never established a color qualification for the suffrage".[3] Professor A. B. Hart stated in his article on "The Realities of Negro Suffrage" that "of the New England communities, except Connecticut, not one in colonial, Revolutionary or later times has ever made any race distinction in its suffrage; Connecticut excluded negroes in 1814 and kept it up till the Civil War".[4] Emil Olbrich in his study of "The Development of Sentiment on Negro Suffrage to 1860" wrote that "the only New England State that forbade negro suffrage was Connecticut", and dated the disfranchisement in that state from the constitution of 1818.[5] Kirk H. Porter, the author of the latest work on suffrage, following Weeks, makes the same error as to Rhode Island, and likewise dates the exclusion of the Connecticut negro from 1818.[6] An examination of the facts will show how misleading the above collection of secondary material would prove to the student.

In the eighteenth century the negro had apparently not been a political factor in any of the New England colonies or states, and the three—Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont—which adopted written constitutions in that period made no distinctions of color in their qualifications for the franchise, nor did they at any time

1 *A Treatise on the Right of Suffrage* (Boston, 1842), p. 63.

2 Am. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report*, 1894, p. 362.

3 "The History of Negro Suffrage in the South", in *Pol. Science Quar.*, IX. 677.

4 Am. Pol. Science Assoc., *Proceedings*, II. 150.

5 Univ. of Wisconsin, *Bulletin*, Hist. Ser., vol. III., no. 1, p. 24.

6 *A History of the Suffrage in the United States* (Univ. of Chicago, 1918), p. 90.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subsequently. Both Rhode Island and Connecticut continued under their old charters, and in those states the qualifications for electors were fixed from time to time by legislative enactment. With the beginning of the new century we find the political influence of the negro question figuring to a mild extent. In Boston, for example, in accounting for the increase of the Federalist vote in 1800, a writer mentioned various groups of voters who had contributed to that result, among them the United Irishmen and "forty men of colour in Boston".[7] In Connecticut, three years later, a correspondent who signed himself "A White Freeman" wrote that there were "two citizens of colour" in Wallingford, both democrats and free. He asked whether if they should be elected as representatives of the town, they would be returned as elected, and, if so, would the Assembly seat them?[8] In 1813 one of the charges brought against the Washington Benevolent Society in Boston was that they had bribed a negro named Prince, who was a Republican and a leader among the colored people, to influence votes for the Federalists. The amount named was "two hundred pieces of silver" a year, and, whether the charge was true or not, the stress laid upon it would indicate that the negro vote had become important.[9]

At the May session of the Connecticut legislature in 1814, it was enacted that "no person shall be admitted a freeman in any town in this state, unless, in addition to the qualifications already required by law, he be a free white male person".[10] I have been unable to find in the contemporary press any comment upon this change. In the May session of 1818 it was again provided in an amendment to the election law that only "*white* male" inhabitants might be made freemen.[11] In the debate in the constitutional convention of the same year, Judge Mitchell moved to erase the words "white male" from the proposed article on elections. The question was divided and first taken on the word "white", but after some debate was lost. The original draft, excluding the negroes, was then submitted and passed by a vote of 103 to 72.[12] This race distinction was renewed in the constitutional amendment of 1845, and the word "white" was not dropped until the amendment of 1876, ten years after the end of the war.[13]

[7] *Independent Chronicle,* Nov. 3, 1800.

[8] *Conn. Courant,* Sept. 7, 1803.

[9] *The First Book of the Washington Benevolents, otherwise called the Book of Knaves* (Boston, 1813), pp. 9 ff.

[10] *Acts and Laws, Conn.,* May session, 1814, p. 162.

[11] *Acts and Laws,* May, 1818.

[12] *Conn. Courant,* Sept. 22, 1818.

[13] *General Statutes of Connecticut,* 1918, pp. 60, 63.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1819 the constitutional convention met in Maine to draw up a constitution for that new state. In Article II., on electors, it was provided that "every male citizen" who complied with certain qualifications should have the franchise. Indians not taxed were not considered citizens. In the debate, it was moved and seconded that negroes should be excluded, but the debate was short and the motion was not carried.[14]

In Rhode Island the legislature altered the law relating to the franchise in 1822, declaring that thereafter *white* persons only could be eligible for admission as freemen.[15] Two years later, a constitutional convention drafted a constitution that was rejected by the people, but in it the franchise was likewise limited to whites.[16] In 1834 another convention was held to draw a constitution but did nothing beyond publishing an address to the people. This address stated that blacks were excluded from voting, and contended, not with reference to them but to property qualifications, that suffrage was a "natural right".[17] In 1836 the suffrage law was amended but still applied only to "white male persons", as was also the case in the amendment of 1840.[18] In some of the other states that disfranchised the negroes, the linking together of taxation and representation became matter for discussion. That this was so in Rhode Island and also that there were some colored freemen (admitted prior to the disfranchising act of 1822), is indicated by an act passed in 1841 providing that "the real and personal estate of Blacks and other people of color not freemen of this State or of any town thereof, shall not be liable to town or state taxes in any manner whatsoever".[19] At the same session of the legislature another amendment to the election law continued the restriction of the franchise to "white male citizens".

In 1842 came the crisis of the "Dorr War". Two conventions sat to draw up constitutions, one legally called by the legislature, and the other the illegal one of the "Suffrage Party". In electing members to the latter, the committee authorized "all male American citizens, (natives and foreigners, and without distinction of color)," to participate.[20] The constitutions, however, as drawn by each of the

[14] *Debates . . . of the Convention . . . 1819* (Portland, 1820), p. 95.

[15] *Public Laws*, 1822, p. 90; *cf.* Newport *Mercury*, Jan. 19, 1822.

[16] *Constitution as adopted by the Convention at Newport, 1824* (Newport, 1824), p. 11.

[17] *An Address to the People of Rhode Island* (Providence, 1834), pp. 33, 46.

[18] *R. I. Acts and Resolves*, January, 1836, p. 3; June, 1840, p. 26.

[19] *Acts and Resolves*, January, 1841, p. 82.

[20] E. R. Potter, *Considerations on the Questions of the Adoption of a Constitution and Extension of Suffrage in Rhode Island* (Boston, 1842, reprinted Central Falls, 1879), p. 17.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two conventions, although doing away with property qualifications, retained the word "white", and thus did nothing for the negro. The questions as to whether negroes should be given the vote, and as to whether this should be made a separate subject for a referendum to the people, were discussed at length in the "legal" convention.[21] The constitution when submitted to the people was defeated by the small majority of 676, and it was said that "some voted against it because the colored people were not placed on the same platform with the white men".[22] However, in the constitution adopted by the people a few weeks later, the restriction to whites was abandoned. A contemporary comment on this change stated that

> up to May last, as we know, the suffrage party were hooted at, for wishing to admit "the *low Irish* and the *niggers*" to the polls. This we heard on the spot. But the tune has turned, now. When the contest came lately, to the sword, the city aristocracy were willing to have the help of the colored people, the most of whom were their dependents, their laborers, their coachmen and their domestics. They enrolled them as firemen, and admitted some of them into the military. And in the now pending experiment of giving the people a Constitution, under the terrors of the "Algerine law", and while citizens are flying from the State to escape imprisonment merely for having voted under the new Suffrage Constitution, and for having defended it in argument,—and while the call for the appointment of delegates to the coming Convention is so apportioned as to throw the power into the hands of the aristocratic minority,—the admission of the dependent colored people to vote, as well as to fight, and the *boast of their support*, answers their selfish purposes, and is impudently trumpeted to their praise.[23]

The evidence as to the disfranchisement of the negro in Rhode Island is thus so ample and clear as to make it surprising that the statement to the contrary has been persistently repeated for nearly a century.

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS.

IS THE PRINTED DIARY OF GIDEON WELLES RELIABLE?

A CASUAL glance at the manuscript of the Welles diary in the Library of Congress at Washington revealed an astounding number of emendations, for a diary whose preface assures the reader that it "has been in no way mutilated or revised". Careful comparison with the published *Diary* showed that almost without exception these

[21] *Journal of the Convention. . . .* (Providence, 1859), pp. 22, 57, 60, 67; *Report of the Committee on Action of the General Assembly* (n. p., 1842), pp. 10 ff.

[22] *Report of Committee, cit. supra,* p. 11.

[23] William Goodell, *The Rights and Wrongs of Rhode Island* (Whitesborough, N. Y., 1842), p. 6.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countless revisions have been incorporated in the printed text, and yet only in the case of some half-dozen passages, which from the context are obviously of later date, has the fact of non-contemporaneity been indicated, in foot-notes. The corrections in the manuscript are literally hundreds, probably thousands. They range in length from one inserted or corrected word, to a passage of several manuscript, and seven printed, pages. When Welles originally wrote his diary he used the left-hand page and left the other conveniently blank; and on these alternate blank pages he wrote in, at a later date, passages from one to several paragraphs in length. Such large insertions are, to be sure, comparatively few, and yet none of them could be quoted as contemporaneous testimony; and as the *Diary* is printed, there is no way, without consulting the manuscript, of determining which passages these doubtful ones are. The smaller additions and corrections inserted between the lines are countless. Yet in reading the printed *Diary* their existence is never suspected.

A careful examination of the manuscript shows almost beyond doubt that it was Gideon Welles himself who revised it. Several types of emendation appear. In one volume Welles used for the additions a blue watery ink that stands out in contrast to the black ink of the original. But in general the revisions were made in pencil, or the usual black ink, or in pencil written over with ink. So the *Diary* must have been revised at least twice, perhaps oftener. That the emendations are of later date than the text is in most cases beyond question; some of the smaller corrections, where the writing is too cramped for comparison, may have been made at the moment of first writing. But in the case of the pencillings and inked-over pencillings, there is no doubt of more recent writing. And for many of the ink emendations, a different shade of blackness of ink, a difference in the style of writing, and at the end of a paragraph or page the distinguishable making of a period into a comma, followed by a script of a different slant, shade, or size, and various orthographical tests, make subsequent emendation a thing of certainty or varying degrees of probability. In the case of the larger passages on the opposite page where comparison is easier, the better, freer hand of Welles's later years makes it a certainty.

Furthermore, all through the 1870's from his retirement from office to his death, Welles was busy writing articles for the *Galaxy* and the *Atlantic Monthly*. He fell into contention with opponents of his administration of the Navy Department, with Charles Francis Adams over the importance of the rôle of Seward in Lincoln's counsels, with Weed over that gentleman's part in forming his and Lin-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coln's plans, and with Grant's radical friends over the place of Johnson in history. It is the manuscript covering the subject of his controversies, the portions from which he wrote his articles, the first narrative volume, and those from 1865 on, that are most emended. And though, even after a study of Welles's correspondence, it is not possible to date the revisions of the diary, various bits of evidence tend to prove that it was after Welles retired from office that he went back over his diary and emended it with a view to possible publication.

The existence of a typewritten copy of a portion of the manuscript, and a pencilled note in its margin, prove what is evident from the manuscript itself, that Mr. John T. Morse, who wrote the introduction to the published *Diary,* saw not the manuscript but a typewritten copy which Edgar Welles assured him was verbatim. Edgar Welles grew up, and Gideon Welles revised his diary, in that "not long ago" of which Morse speaks, when "the task of editing private writings . . . was taken to imply the duty of excision and amendment so as to bring the printed pages into accord with supposed proprieties". So the father's revision of the diary with a view to publication is understandable and excusable, as is the son's explicit assurance that the text "has been in no way mutilated or revised", for it certainly was not *by the editor*; and that is what the son means. So textual criticism of the *Diary* resolves itself not into condemnation of Welles or his son, nor of Morse for accepting Welles's honestly made though misleading statement, but into an evaluation of the printed *Diary* as it stands in a form whose merit is certainly lessened by Edgar Welles's misconception of rules of editing.

Doubtful passages fall into two categories, those in which the print and manuscript do not correspond, and those which were revised in manuscript. Numerous omissions occur that fall only under an extremely loose application of the stated rule of omitting "strong expressions purely personal and private", or that are entirely inexplicable. Such omissions are that of the remark that the sadness of Lincoln's funeral was "beyond conception by the whole people", and that "the lamentation was sincere", and that of a note of April 25, 1868, describing the rôles of Fessenden and Grimes in Schofield's appointment as Secretary of War, and their attitude toward the impeachment of Johnson. More difficult to explain than omissions in printing are the portions of the printed text that do not appear in the manuscript. The first of these spurious passages is the whole entry of August 10 and 11, 1862, covering nine printed pages, which begins with the commonplace comment that "The last two days have been

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

excessively warm". The only possible explanation seems that to which a clue is given by a further passage printed in the *Diary,* which appears only on a loose piece of paper apparently torn from a smaller book and inserted at its proper place. It seems evident that Welles must have recopied this first much-corrected manuscript volume, that the printed text must have been taken from the recopied volume, but that the original remains in the Library of Congress. It makes one wonder if the several succeeding volumes, which are so little emended, are after all the original manuscript or a recopied version. In any case, after the first manuscript volume no further passages appear in print which are not found in the manuscript as original text or emendations.

Of the second sort of doubtful passages, revisions of the original text made by Gideon Welles himself, there are hundreds. Aside from justifiable corrections of punctuation and spelling made both by the father in revising and by the son in editing, the most numerous class of revisions are the countless small changes in phrasing which in no way alter the sense. Some of these Welles probably made at the time of writing; probably most of them were made in the later revisions; it is in many cases hard to determine which was the case. Though the original phrasing would be preferable, one could excuse this natural desire of the author to polish up his original expressions for publication, as this class of revision does not affect the text. The difficulty is that it runs imperceptibly into a kind that does, the type that explains or clarifies. It consists in a more concrete word here, in an addition of an explanatory clause there. This does clarify, but, done ten years after the original was written, it inevitably changes the picture. When Welles mentioned "several generals" on September 2, 1862, and in later years substituted "McClellan, Franklin, Fitz-John Porter and perhaps some others", his memory may have served him correctly, but he may wrongly have remembered one. When he added to a mention of McClellan's name the day before, the fact that Chase and Stanton disliked him, he probably was stating a fact that he learned from later events.

Into another but a related category fall the changes which tend to add color, dramatic force, or picturesqueness, descriptive detail which enlivens rather than clarifies. Such additions distort the picture, or at least render it unreliable historically, by unconsciously creating impressions formed at a later time, or by adding from memory details for which the memory of an old man is not trustworthy. Examples of such revisions are the comment appended to an interview with Halleck, that he "began to rub his elbows and

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without thanking me or acknowledgement of any kind said"; the changing of "Stanton said" on September 2, 1862, to read, "Stanton, in a suppressed voice, trembling with excitement, said"; the detail on May 23, 1866, of the men "standing each side of him [Stanton] with a lighted candle"; and the phrase characterizing Williams of Oregon as "a third-rate lawyer who got into the Senate from that remote state". Such revisions, freely made, injure the *Diary* by coloring with Welles's later views what purports to be contemporaneous description.

Another form of revision in which Welles indulged, notably in the cases of Seward, Stanton, and Grant, was conscious changing of the text, not to vivify, but to add venom commensurate with the growth of his aversion for these men. Thus to an early interview with Halleck, he added a comment of several lines: "Strange that this change of military operations should have been made without Cabinet consultation. . . . But Stanton is so absorbed in his scheme to get rid of McClellan that other and more important matters are neglected." To the entry of September 6, 1862, he added, "The War Department is bewildered, knows but little, does nothing, proposes nothing." It was in after years, too, that he injected under June 24, 1866, the comment that "Trumbull and the Senators generally thought Seward too meddlesome and presuming". To a mention on June 5, 1866, of "a claim of Madame Bertinatti", he later appended the phrase "a piece of favoritism in which the President is imposed upon by Seward and Stanton". Similarly to a later date belong the comment of June 30, 1866, that "Stanton has assumed frankness, but his coarse manner covers a good deal of subtle duplicity", and most of the paragraph of May 21, 1868, in derogation of Grant. Numerous cases massed together paint a picture even worse than the contemporaneous sketch of these men; and the change noticeably wrought in their pictures is made, by fewer and less perceptible revisions, in the case of lesser men.

Welles also revised portions of his manuscript to satisfy his pride in his powers of judgment or prophecy. One example will suffice. To the entry of June 18, 1866, is added, in light of later events, the seeming prophecy: "The call, if not the Convention itself, is, I think, perverted to an intrigue in behalf of the old Whig party, on which Weed and Seward rely"; and again, "The public is ripe for a convention, but this call is an artful contrivance to weaken it", and "I have my doubts if the flimsy expedient will do much good". Furthermore, in a few cases, when subsequently gathered information proved a fact erroneous, or proved Welles's

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attitude mistaken, Welles omitted or entirely changed a passage. Thus by the addition of two or three paragraphs on April 23 and 25, 1865, he changed grave doubts about the Sherman episode into a confidence in Sherman that later events warranted.

The least numerous type of revisions, but one of the most dangerous, is the insertion of comparatively long passages embracing a number of details. Through their length, if nothing else, these passages assume importance and they are unreliable historically. The longest example, covering several pages, is the one dealing with New York politics which H. B. Learned in his review of the edited *Diary* (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XVII. 632) suspected because of its context. Unfortunately the context of numerous other such passages does not raise doubts of contemporaneity, though they are just as surely of later date.

It remains to evaluate the *Diary* as a whole. The manuscript remains one of the most important single sources of American history. The usefulness of the printed *Diary* is doubtful. Chapter I., which is not put forth as diary, is of no more use than the reminiscences of an old man. The rest of the *Diary* becomes dangerous as source-material. It is true that one might quote copiously without encountering one of the dubious passages, but the fact that through the *Diary* are scattered, indeterminably, passages no more valuable than reminiscences of late life, makes it necessary for the historian to go to the manuscript for citation. Since, after all, most of the revisions are of slight importance, the text remains valuable for the average reader, provided he makes mental allowance for a little coloring, and for prejudice against Seward, Stanton, Grant, and others, of which the asperity of expression has been heightened by revisions of the original text. The tragedy is that a valuable source has, in the editing, been stripped of its reliability as source-material, when, had Edgar Welles known the rules of editing, or had chance brought the original instead of a copy before the eyes of Mr. Morse, the *Diary*, by proper indication of emendations, might, without losing aught in effectiveness, have gained the reliability that has too trustingly been accredited to it in its printed form, and of which it *is* possessed in manuscript where contemporaneity and later revision are easily distinguishable.

HOWARD K. BEALE.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DOCUMENTS

1. *Instruction and Note of Robert Smith, 1810, 1811.*

JAMES MADISON, in the memorandum which he left among his papers and which was not printed until after his death, writing an account of his dismissal of Robert Smith from the office of Secretary of State, made the charge against him that it was necessary to rewrite many of Smith's letters, because they were "crude and inadequate", when brought in draft to him (Madison's *Writings,* ed. Hunt, VIII. 137). Henry Adams has taken up this charge and greatly exaggerated its onus and has several times spoken of Smith as "illiterate" and of Madison as having (from internal evidence) entirely written the more important papers. The necessary proof of the incorrectness of these charges may be found in Smith's letter to General Turreau, the French minister in Washington, of December 18, 1810 (*Am. State Papers, For. Rel.,* III. 402), a document publicly claimed by Smith as entirely his own in his *Address to the American People*—a claim never denied by Madison.

Further and convincing proofs of Smith's ability to compose despatches are found in the drafts of two letters which Madison would not permit him to despatch, which drafts Smith preserved and which are now in the possession of his grandson, Capt. John Donnell Smith of Baltimore.

The earlier of these, an "instruction", was intended to be sent on June 5, 1810, to General John Armstrong, our minister at Paris, in response to several despatches from him, transmitting among other news a copy of the note which Armstrong had received from the Duc de Cadore dated February 14. The instruction as finally sent is printed in *Am. State Papers,* III. 384. The instruction as originally drafted in Smith's own handwriting is given below.

The second document, of which Smith preserved the draft, was a note written on February 20, 1811, and was intended to be sent to M. Serrurier, the new French minister to the United States. Madison would not permit it to be sent at all. Its text follows the instruction.

BERNARD C. STEINER.

Genl. Armstrong

Your letters of the with their respective enclosures were received on the day of

In the note of the Duke of Cadore nothing can be perceived to justify

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the seizure of American property in the ports of France and in those of her allies. The facts as well as the arguments which it has opened are confuted by events known to the world and particularly by that moderation of temper which has invariably distinguished the conduct of this Govt. towards the Belligerent nations. After a forbearance equalled only by our steady observance of the laws of Neutrality and of the immutable principles of justice, it is with no little surprise that the President discerns in the Fr. Govt. a disposition to represent the U. S. as the original aggressor. An act of violence, which under existing circumstances is scarcely less than an act of war, necessarily required an explanation, which would be satisfactory not only to the U. S. but to the whole world. But the note of the Duke of Cadore, instead of a justification, has not furnished even a plausible palliation or a reasonable apology for the seizure of the American property.

There has never been a period of time when the U. S. have ceased to protest against the Br. orders in Council. With regard to the resistance which the U. S. may have deemed it proper to oppose to such unlawful restrictions, it obviously belonged to the American Govt. alone to prescribe the mode. If a system of exclusion of the vessels and merchandise of the Belligerent powers from our ports has been preferred to war; if municipal prohibition has been resorted to instead of invasive retaliation, with what propriety can the Emperor of the French pretend to see in that method of proceeding any thing else than a lawful exercise of sovereign power? To construe the exercise of this power into a cause of war-like reprisal is a species of dictation which, could it be admitted, would have a tendency to subvert the sovereignty of the U. States.

France has converted our law of exclusion into a pretext for the seizure of the property of the citizens of the U. S. This statute was also in force against the vessels of G. B. If its operation had been considered by the Fr. Govt. as of sufficient efficacy to justify this pretended reprisal, that very operation, as it would have been more severely felt by G. B., ought also to have been considered as constituting a resistance to her orders, the non-existence of which resistance has been stated by the Duke of Cadore as the pretext for the act of violence exercised on the American property. The U. S. having resisted the British orders the real ground of complaint would seem to be, not so much that the American Govt. has not resisted a tax on their navigation, as that it has likewise resisted the French decrees, which had assumed a prescriptive power over the policy of the U. S. as reprehensible as the attempt of the Br. Govt. to levy contraventions on our trade was obnoxious. Placed in a situation where a tax was proclaimed on the one hand and a rule of action presented on the other, the U. S. owed it to their own honor to resist with corresponding measures the cupidity of the one and the presumption of the other. When the American Govt. sees in the provisions of the Br. Orders an assumption of maritime power in contravention of the law of nations, how can it fail also to perceive in the French decrees the adoption of a principle equally derogatory and injurious to the neutral character of the U. S.?

The pretension of subjecting American navigation to a tax advanced by the Br. order of Nov. 1807 was, in reality, withdrawn by the order of the 26 of Apr. 1809. Yet ten months subsequent to the recall of that pretension, its alledged existence is made the basis of reproach against the American Govt. by the Emperor of the French. It would be fruitless

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to comment upon the disposition to insist upon the prevailing influence of a fact which no longer exists; which, when it did exist, was uniformly combatted and the final extinction of which was the manifest consequence of the measures of this Govt.

If the American Govt. has seized Fr. vessels, as erroneously asserted in the note of the Duke of Cadore, the occurrence could only have been attributed to the temerity of their owners or commanders, who, after a previous notification from the 5 March to the 20 May, of the act of exclusion, would have strangely presumed upon impunity in the violation of a prohibitory municipal law of the U. S.—Had France interdicted to our vessels all the ports within the sphere of her influence and had she given a warning of equal duration with that given by our law, there would have been no cause of complaint on the part of the U. States. The Fr. Govt. would not then have had the opportunity of exercising its power in a manner as contrary to the forms as to the spirit of justice, over the property of the citizens of the U. S.

It was at all times in the power of France to suspend, with regard to herself, our acts of exclusion, of which she complains, by simply annulling or modifying her decrees. Propositions to this effect have been made to her Govt. through you. They were not accepted. On the contrary a policy was preferred, which was calculated to produce any other result than that of a good understanding between the two countries. By the Act of Congress of the last Session an opportunity is again afforded to his Imperial Majesty to establish the most amicable relations between the U. S. and France. Let him withdraw or modify his decrees, let him restore the property of our citizens so unjustly seized and a law of the U. S. exists, which authorizes the Prest. to promote the best possible understanding with France and to impose a system of exclusion against the ships and merchandise of G. B. in the event of her failing to conform to the same just terms of conciliation. In fine, as the Emperor will now be acquainted with the fact that no French vessels have been unlawfully seized in the ports of the U. S., as the Law of exclusion against the commerce of France is no more in operation, there can be no longer a solitary reasonable pretext for procrastinating the delivery of the American property, detained by the Fr. Govt., into the possession of the respective owners.

These observations you will not fail to present to the view of the Fr. Govt. in order that the Emperor may learn that the U. S. insist upon nothing but their acknowledged right and that they still entertain a desire to adjust all differences with the Govt. of France upon a basis equally beneficial and honorable to both nations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
February 20th–1811

Sir,

Desirous of laying before the President, with the utmost precision, the substance of our conference of this day, and knowing that verbal communications are not unfrequently misunderstood, I consider it proper to propose to you in a written form the questions, which I have had the honor of submitting to you in conversation, namely:

1st. Were the Berlin and Milan Decrees revoked in whole or in part on the first day of last November? Or have they at any time posterior

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to that day been so revoked? Or have you instructions from your Government to give to this Government any assurance or explanation in relation to the revocation or modification of these Decrees?

2nd. Do the existing Decrees of France admit into French ports, with or without licences, American vessels laden with the produce of the United States? and under what regulations and conditions?

3. Do they admit into French ports with or without licences, American vessels laden with articles not the produce of the United States, and under what regulations and conditions?

4. Do they permit American vessels, with or without licences, to return from France to the United States, and upon what terms and conditions?

5. Is the importation into France of any articles the produce of the United States absolutely prohibited? and if so, what are the articles so prohibited, and especially are tobacco and cotton.

6. Have you instructions from your Government to give to this Government any assurance or explanation in relation to the American vessels and cargoes seized under the Rambuillet Decree?

P.S. The sending of this letter not approved by the President.

R. S.

2. *The Escape of Louis Philippe, 1848.*

For the opportunity to print the following letters, we are indebted to Dr. Louis H. Dielman, of the Peabody Institute in Baltimore, and to their possessor, Miss Mary Hamman of Baltimore and New York, to whose grandfather, John Jones, the letters were addressed by his brother William. William Winfred Jones was vice-consul at Havre from 1845 to 1850.[1]

The narrative contained in the first letter corresponds closely with the story given from French sources by the Marquis de Flers,[2] and with that given by the consul at Havre, Mr. Jones's superior in office, in the interesting letter to Palmerston, March 3, 1848, printed in *The Letters of Queen Victoria.*[3]

Something further may be said respecting this consul. He was none other than George W. Featherstonhaugh, a man of some fame in the history of American science and of American boundary disputes. He was born in London in 1780, came early to the United States, married a daughter of Judge James Duane, and in 1812, living then at Duanesburg, near Schenectady, began a public advocacy of railroads. In 1826, in conjunction with Stephen Van Rensselaer, he procured from the legislature the charter of the Mohawk and Hudson Railroad, one of the earliest railway charters in America.[4]

[1] *Foreign Office List,* 1859.

[2] *Le Roi Louis Philippe: Vie Anecdotique* (Paris, 1891), pp. 162–166.

[3] II. 184–188.

[4] G. S. Roberts, *Old Schenectady* (Schenectady, 1904), pp. 143–145.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Then he removed to Philadelphia, where he established, in 1831, the *Monthly American Journal of Geology and Natural History*. It was a short-lived magazine, but certainly Featherstonhaugh was one of the pioneers of American geology. Professor George P. Merrill in *The First One Hundred Years of American Geology* (New Haven, 1924)[5] commends him as the originator of several important doctrines or opinions in that field. He says, "Featherstonhaugh was a man of some means, and came to America when quite young, apparently through the mere love of travel. Being of good presence—standing more than six feet in height, well educated, and an accomplished musician—he easily procured admission into the best of society, married an American girl", etc. He describes him as an overfastidious Englishman, abounding in criticism of American conditions, and therefore unpopular. But the surveys which he carried out as United States Geologist[6] took him into the rougher parts of the country, and his two books of travel, *Excursion through the Slave States* and *A Canoe Voyage up the Minnay Sotor*,[7] relate mainly to such regions, as they were in 1834–1837, and are quite as just and amiable as the books of most British travellers of that period. Featherstonhaugh was also employed by the British government in 1839 in making an *ex parte* survey of the boundary between New Brunswick and Maine,[8] and in 1843 printed *Some Observations upon the Treaty of Washington*, severely critical of Lord Ashburton's work. In 1844 he was made British consul at Havre, Great Britain's chief consular post in France, and he held that office till his death, on September 27, 1866. Besides the books to which allusion has already been made, he published a translation of Cicero's *Republic* (New York, 1828), *The Death of Ugolino: a Tragedy* (Philadelphia, 1830), and a translation of Manzoni's *I Promessi Sposi* (Washington, 1834).

British Consulate, HAVRE, 6 March /48.

My dearest John,

Owing to the recent political disturbance in this country, the consequences of which have imposed severe duties on this Consulate, I have been unable to address you earlier. You have no doubt read the accounts of this new french Revolution in the Journals. It occured in a moment

[5] Pp. 137–138, 161–165.

[6] *Geological Report of an Examination made in 1834 of the Elevated Country between the Missouri and the Red Rivers* (Washington, 1835), and *Report of a Geological Reconnoissance made in 1835 from the Seat of Government to the Côteau du Prairie* (Washington, 1836).

[7] London, 1844 and 1847.

[8] Moore, *International Arbitrations*, I. 141–142; Burrage, *Maine in the Northeastern Boundary Controversy*, pp. 295–297.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as it were,—perfect tranquillity one day, and fighting and bloodshed the next—a dynasty secured by 17 years of peace (an age for France) suddenly overturned in 24 hours, and the King Louis Philippe a fugitive, hiding his grey head in peasents' cottages. In relation to this I have a curious tale to tell you, which were you to read in a Romance, you would not believe. This will the more interest you, as I was one of the principal parties concerned in the King's escape from this country, for such is the subject I have to write about. The Gouvernement Provisoire as it terms itself had sent word to the Commissary General of this Department to arrest the members of the late Govern't and the royal family if they were found about here. About the 2nd and 3rd of this month we received private information that the King and Queen of the French were lurking about Trouville (near Honfleur). An English steamer had been waiting some days at the Consuls order here, and it was determined between us to try to get the Royal party away. I was sent over to Honfleur to the house of a partizan of Louis Philippes and I found the King and Queen there. They had been obliged to quit Trouville in disguise owing to the people surmising who they were, and collecting round the house in great numbers. The King perceiving that he was betrayed, walked coolly out of a back door of the house he had lodged in, and attended by two servants, got into the wood close by. One went off at dusk to procure a cart, and it was in this condition the King, who a fortnight ago ruled the destinies of 31 millions of people, was brought to Honfleur. Two hours after his arrival there, I called, and found him in bed, much exhausted and the Queen sitting beside them [*sic*]. I announced myself as the Vice Consul at Havre, bringing letters from the Consul. The King shook my hand, and told me that he would confide in me. I began suggesting various plans of escape, which I told him I could not consider prudent, recommending him to remain perfectly quiet until the evening, when I would return with proper means for his evasion. This he agreed to, and I lost no time in regaining the steam boat which had brought me over. There was but just time for it was already about leaving the Port. In the evening I returned again by the same boat, the Captain of which had agreed on the payment of a few thousand francs to keep his boat ready until dusk. On reaching Honfleur I mounted the Montjoli which I dare say you know, and I soon attained the Kings hiding place. Not a moment was lost in putting on disguises which I had brought, and accompanied by Generals Dumas and Rumigny who had followed the Royal sufferers in their adversity, we got the King and Queen into the Honfleur Ferry boat, which soon quitted the Port, and reached Havre. Here the Consul was waiting to receive them, and led them immediately to a steamer, which he had kept in readiness two days. In ten minutes after embarking, Louis Philippe and his Queen were out of all danger and the boat was putting forth all its steam for Newhaven. During the passage from Honfleur to Havre, I had frequent opportunity of conversing with the King, and he told me several of the adventures that had happened to him, in coming from Paris. "You talk" said he "of your Charles the 2nd and Boscobel, but I have gone through more than him." And he made use of these remarkable words "Charles the tenth was dethroned for breaking the charter, I on the contrary for defending it." He assumed considerable cheerfulness even at this moment, when his escape seemed critical, and joked a little, laughing very heartily at his own jests. After

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an interval of silence, he turned round to me and said—"What would your London Aldermen have done, if they had been disappointed of a good dinner like the Reform Banquetters?" which amused him heartily. He shook me repeatedly by the hand, and asked my name, which he repeated twice, and then said, "he would not forget me".

The Consul was so pleased with my exertions, and the successful termination of our enterprize, that not satisfied with telling me that "I had acted admirably", he wrote a special despatch to Lord Palmerston in my favour, about 2 days ago. In it he says—"I cannot omit submitting to Your Lordship's favorable consideration Mr. William Jones the Vice Consul here, whose zeal, activity, and intelligence, have principally conduced to the success of this undertaking. Mr. Jones ran undefined but great risks in its accomplishment and I have the certain conviction that Your Lordship will allow me to present him with a reward for his meritorious conduct." In a few days therefore perhaps I may receive something. At any rate I shall always have the satisfaction of knowing that I have rendered a material service to the King—for we have since ascertained, that one *hour* after the boat had left Honfleur with its royal Charge, the house in which the King had lodged, was surrounded by a file of soldiers with the Sous prefet at their [head] to arrest him! I have several souvenirs of this singular event—a plan of escape drawn up by the King himself is the most valuable. I will write to you at greater length by and bye. In the meantime

[Bel]ieve me
ever, my dear Brother
Your affectionate
WM JONES

Sarah and the children are well.
Jane and her family *do*.
Alfred is going on very well.
Write soon.

15 Clifton Place
Camberwell New Road
CAMBERWELL
June 8, 1852

My dear John,

It is a very long time indeed since I last addressed you, and I am afraid that you have cast me from your thoughts as ungrateful and thoughtless, but my dear brother, it is not a mere letter that can convey all the affection I entertain for you and yours, and many adverse circumstances have occured to compel me almost to relinquish a correspondence with those nearest and best beloved to me. You shall judge. The share I had in effecting Louis Philippe's Escape from France, after the Revolution of 1848, instead of proving, as it should have done, a source of advantage to me, has occasioned me much tribulation and personal discomfort. The Consul at Havre, a very vain old man, wishing to obtain promotion, gave himself the entire credit of the affair with Lord Palmerston, and overlooked the claims of two distinguished Frenchmen, who had rendered us and the old King important services on that occasion. On their representation to Lord Palmerston, the Consul was required to give an explanation, and to support his assertions, he wanted me to sign a declaration that he (the Consul) had *alone* effected Louis Philippe's

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Escape *unaided*. Of course I refused to support his falsehood, and was in consequence compelled to leave. I appealed to Lord Palmerston and a lengthy and tedious correspondence ensued, during which I was detained 9 months in London, subsisting myself by writing for the magazines and newspapers. The sequel of the enquiry was, as all these matters generally terminate, might overcame right. The Consul's friends flocked to his rescue. He received a letter of blame and kept his place. I was politely informed that Lord P. regretted he could not give me any appointment at that time. I was deeply mortified but my energies did not desert me. One of the magazine proprietors offered me the Editorship of two periodicals, which I accepted at a salary of 150£ a year. I have been thus engaged about seven months, but despite great exertions, and an amount of physical and mental labour, which has greatly injured my health, I find now that the extravagance of the person I am engaged with is leading him to ruin; in fact, he cannot, with debts of 25,000£ get over the next month. Thus I have the prospect again of being thrown on the world, with the extra disadvantage that the severe application to my editorial duties, such as writing until 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning, four nights out of the seven, has much effected my health, . . . I am determined to seek a milder climate . . . I am disposed to think that America would answer my wishes, and your own neighbourhood would present the advantages I desire. . . .

3. *Pearl Harbor, 1873.*

To the mission described in the ensuing report, preserved in the archives of the War Department at Washington, Gen. John McAllister Schofield (b. September 29, 1831; d. March 4, 1906) went from his post-bellum station on the Pacific Coast with a distinguished reputation. Having graduated from West Point in 1853, he entered the Civil War as a captain and came out with the permanent rank of brigadier-general, a brevet major-generalcy, and a medal of honor for conspicuous gallantry in action. After the war he and Grant were actively agitating for intervention in Mexico for the ousting of Maximilian and the support of Juárez, when he was sent to Paris on a diplomatic mission to indicate the attitude of the United States; and during parts of 1868 and 1869 he served as Secretary of War. Lieut.-Col. Burton S. Alexander, of the Corps of Engineers, who accompanied him, likewise served with distinction through the Civil War, participating in the battle of Bull Run and the siege operations at Yorktown. He likewise had been on mission in Paris; but his assignments were chiefly of an engineering character.

From the time when the first American agent was appointed to reside in the Hawaiian Islands in 1820, they had continued to be a rendezvous for American whaling and trading ships in the Pacific and to attract the attention of American statesmen.[1] Successive

[1] Moore, *Digest of International Law*, I. 475–494.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secretaries of State had advised foreign countries as to the alarm the United States would feel were the islands to pass into foreign hands, and the determination of the United States not to assent to their transfer. Blaine and Bayard and Webster and Fish were equally emphatic. The Hawaiian Islands form a valuable defensive outpost for the protection of our western coast from Panama to Alaska.[2] It is worthy of note that King Kalakaua visited the United States in 1874, and that the reciprocity suggested by General Schofield was soon made a fact.[3] The reasons for the eventual annexation are cogently and succinctly set forth in a few pages of *A Treatise on International Law including American Diplomacy,* by the Hon. Cushman K. Davis, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,[4] who in 1901 said—among other things—that Hawaii is "one of the most important strategic and commercial points on the face of the earth" and that "the preponderating productive, proprietary, and commercial interests of the Islands are in the hands of the citizens of the United States".

ELBRIDGE COLBY.

Confidential

SAN FRANCISCO, California.
May 8, 1873.

Hon. Wm. W. Belknap,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

Sir:

In compliance with your confidential instructions of the 24th June 1872, we have the honor to state that we have visited the Sandwich Islands, and ascertained the defensive capabilities of their different ports, examined into their commercial facilities, and collected all the information in our power on other subjects in reference to which we ought to be informed in the event of a war with a powerful maritime nation, and we have now the honor to submit the following:

Report

We left this City on the 30th of December, 1872, on board the U. S. Steamer "California" the Flagship of Rear Admiral Pennock, U. S. Navy, and arrived at Honolulu January 15, 1873. Admiral Pennock had received instructions from our Government to proceed to the Sandwich Islands in his flagship and bring to the United States the late King Kamahameha V. A few days before sailing however, the news of the death of the King was received in San Francisco. When we arrived at Honolulu, we found a new King, Lunalilo, had been elected by an almost

[2] Summerall, "Strategic Importance of Hawaii", in *Coast Artillery Journal,* July, 1924.

[3] 19 *Statutes at Large* 625.

[4] Pp. 120–135.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unanimous vote of the people. He had been inaugurated and his government was established in an orderly manner.

At an audience with the King and his ministers, Admiral Pennock made known his instructions from the Secretary of the Navy, to offer a passage to the late King to the United States. We were present at this interview, and the announcement of the generous intentions of the Government of the United States toward the late King appeared to establish, at once, the best relations between the new King and Admiral Pennock, as also between the members of his government and ourselves.

This was fortunate, as it gave us all desirable facilities for accomplishing the objects of our visit; enabled us to converse frankly with the King and his ministers upon the subject, and to ascertain their feelings and wishes concerning it, as well as their general policy towards the United States.

We ascertained from the officers of the U. S. Navy, from maps and from sea-faring men, that Honolulu is the only good commercial harbor on the whole group of the Sandwich Islands. There are many other so-called harbors, or places for anchorage, but they are mostly open roadsteads, affording shelter only from certain winds, and they are all entirely incapable of being defended by shore batteries. Even the harbor of Honolulu itself cannot be defended from the shore. It is a small harbor lying seaward from the land, and only protected from the sea by outlying coral reefs. An enemy could take up his position outside of the entrance to the harbor and command the entire anchorage, as well as the town of Honolulu itself. This harbor would therefore be of no use to us as a harbor of refuge in a war with a powerful maritime nation.

With one exception there is no harbor on the Islands that can be made to satisfy all the conditions necessary for a harbor of refuge in time of war. This is the harbor of "Ewa" or "Pearl River" situated in the Island of Oahu, about seven miles west of Honolulu. Pearl River is a fine sheet of deep water extending inland about six miles from its mouth, where it could be completely defended by shore batteries. The depth of water after passing the bar is ample for any vessel.

Pearl River is not a true river; it partakes more of the character of an estuary. It is divided into three portions called "locks"—the east-lock, the middle-lock, and the west-lock—the three together affording some thirty miles of water front, with deep water in the channels. Of these locks the east lock is the best, having most room, the deepest water, and presenting the greatest facilities for shore improvements. In the middle of this lock there is an island called "Rabbit Island", having deep water close to its shores and fine anchorage all around it. This island is a level coral island rising only a few feet above high water level. It is destitute of fresh water, but there is great abundance of good water on the adjacent shores which could be carried to the island at small expense.

From our examinations we are of the opinion that this island and the adjacent shore to the north and west of it afford the most advantageous location for a Naval depot of supplies and equipment in all these waters. But there is not sufficient water, at present, for heavy vessels to enter this Pearl river harbor. At the entrance of the harbor is a coral reef some two hundred and fifty to three hundred yards in width with a depth of water of only two to three fathoms on the reef at low water. This reef appears to extend around the island, being broken only at the en-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trance to Honolulu Harbor, and in fact we are informed that a platform of coral reefs fringes most of the shores of all the islands of the Hawaiian Group, broken only in few places. This coral found at the entrance to Pearl River, is "dead"—That is it is not growing, and the reef is therefore not increasing in size. This ridge of coral forms a barrier, or bar, across the entrance to this harbor, about three hundred yards wide measuring perpendicularly to the shore. It is comparatively level on top with from two to three fathoms of water over it at low tide. Its sides are vertical, or nearly so, the depth of water increasing in a few feet to four or five fathoms. The outer, or sea side, then is found to be steeper than the inner or shore side. At the distance of half a mile outside of the reef there is a depth of fifteen fathoms, while at the same distance inside the reef the depth is only eight fathoms.

If this coral barrier were removed, Pearl River Harbor would seem to have all, or nearly all, the necessary properties to enable it to be converted into a good harbor of refuge. It could be completely defended by inexpensive batteries on either or both shores firing across a narrow channel of entrance. Its waters are deep enough for the largest vessels of war, and its locks, particularly around Rabbit Island, are spacious enough for a large number of vessels to ride at anchor, in perfect security against all storms. Its shores are suitable for building proper establishments for sheltering the necessary supplies for a naval establishment; such as magazines of ammunition, provisions, coal, spars, rigging, etc., while the island of Oahu, upon which it is situated, could furnish fresh provisions, meat, fruits, and vegetables in large quantities.

Such being the properties of this harbor, and it being the only one on these islands possessing all the requisites, except depth of water on the bar, the question arises, Can the coral reef at its entrance be removed? If so, at what cost? And again, if it be removed, would the channel fill up, or would it remain open under the influence of natural causes?

A correct answer to these questions in detail, cannot be given without a survey of the entrance to this harbor. Under the supposition that full information on this subject would become necessary in case negotiations were entered upon looking to the cession of Pearl River Harbor to the United States, we informally requested Admiral Pennock to include a detailed survey of the entrance to this harbor in his examinations and surveys of the harbors of these Islands. The Admiral promised to have such survey made. When it is received a detailed estimate of the cost of removing the coral barrier can be made.

We will state, however, that Lieut. Colonel Alexander crossed this bar several times while we were at Honolulu. He did not undertake a survey but he took soundings on and around the reef, and examined its character and outline. He found the reef composed mostly of coral *in situ*, covered over in small patches for a few inches in depth, with coral sand; being fragments of coral and coral rock thrown upon the reef and ground to pieces under the action of the waves and tidal currents. It is his opinion that an entrance could easily be cut through this coral reef by surface blasting, and that the fine debris would be washed sea-ward under the influence of the Currents, while the larger masses could be removed by dredging or by divers: the islands furnishing many men skilled in such business.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He further gives it as his opinion, founded on the examinations he was able to make, that the amount of coral to be removed to open a channel two hundred yards in width with a depth of twenty-six feet of water at low tide, would be about two hundred and fifty thousand cubic yards, and that it could be removed for one dollar per cubic yard, or for a sum of about two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. It should be observed however that this is only an approximate estimate of the cost of this work. Detail estimates could only be made after accurate surveys and thorough investigation, made for this special purpose.

As the entrance to Honolulu harbor shows no tendency to fill up, and as the entrance to Pearl River, if opened, will be almost exactly like that of Honolulu, we see no reason, at present, to fear a filling up on the bar after a passage through the coral reef at its mouth shall have been secured. Upon this point however, it will be safe to withhold opinions until the character of the bottom just outside the coral reef is accurately ascertained. If the survey and examination should show a large quantity of coral sand there, and if the resulting currents of the ebb-tide do not remove it, it is possible that some of this sand might accumulate in the channel of entrance during storms from seaward.

In case it should become the policy of the Government of the United States to obtain the possession of this harbor for naval purposes, jurisdiction over all the waters of Pearl River with the adjacent shores to the distance of four miles from any anchorage should be ceded to the United States by the Hawaiian Government. This would be necessary in order to enable the Government to defend its depots and anchorages, in time of war, by works located on its own territory. Such a cession of jurisdiction would embrace a parallelogram of about ten by twelve miles.

It would not be necessary however for the government of the United States to own all this land. On the contrary, Rabbit Island and a few thousand acres of the shore to the northward and westward of it, the limits of which could be determined after careful survey, with sufficient land on either side of the entrance of the harbor for fortification purposes, equal in area to about one square mile on either side, would be all the land which it would be necessary for the government to own. All the rest of the land which might be embraced in any cession of jurisdiction could remain in the hands of the present owners.

We remark that the Hawaiian Government is now having a survey made of Pearl River and the vicinity. This survey will show the nature of the country and the ownership of all abutting lands. When it is completed it will enable us to define distinctly the boundaries of the district over which jurisdiction should be ceded, in case our government wishes to acquire possession of that harbor. We can then also designate what land the government would require for naval purposes and for fortifications, at the entrance to the harbor.

From what we could learn of the feelings of the Hawaiian Government on this subject, we believe it would be possible for the United States to obtain such a cession of jurisdiction and of land, as we have indicated, should it become the policy of the Government to establish a naval depot in these islands. The cession of Pearl River and of so much of the surrounding district as might be necessary for its defense, and the title to all the positions which would be occupied by the Government either for naval or military purposes, would probably be freely given by the Government of these Islands as a quid pro quo for a reciprocity treaty.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We remark in this connection, that sugar is the principal product of these islands, and that it is mostly exported to the Pacific Coast of the United States. The great object of the Hawaiian Government in seeking a reciprocity treaty with the United States has been and will probably continue to be, to relieve its sugar planters from the operation of our tariff on that article.

The cession of Pearl River could probably be obtained by the United States in consideration of the repeal of the duty on Sandwich Islands sugar. Indeed the sugar planters are so anxious for a reciprocity treaty, or so anxious rather for free trade in sugar with the United States that many of them openly proclaim themselves in favor of annexation of these Islands to the United States.

The members of the present government of the Hawaiian Islands seem fully alive to the necessity of relieving their principal industry from the heavy burden under which it now suffers and no other mode of relief seems possible but annexation or reciprocity.

Neither the Government nor the Native people of the Islands are, it is believed, prepared to consider the question of annexation, at the present time, even if the United States desired to propose it, but the cession of Pearl River Harbor as an equivalent for free trade, is freely discussed and favorably considered by the government and people.

It is to be observed that if the United States are ever to have a harbor of refuge and naval station in the Hawaiian Islands in the event of war, the harbor must be prepared in advance by the removal of the Pearl River bar. When war has begun it will be too late to make this harbor available and there is no other suitable harbor on these islands.

We have the honor to be

Very respectfully

Your obedient servants,

J. M. SCHOFIELD,
Major General, U. S. A.

B. S. ALEXANDER,
Lt. Col., Engrs.
Brevet Brig. Gen. U. S. A.

Hon. Wm. W. Belknap,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The New Larned History for Ready Reference, Reading, and Research: the Actual Words of the World's Best Historians, Biographers, and Specialists. . . . Based on the work of the late J. N. LARNED, now completely revised, enlarged, and brought up to date. In twelve volumes. Volume X., *Sweden–U. S. A. 1864*; volume XI., *U. S. A. 1865–World War, 1914*; volume XII., *World War, 1915—ZYP, Supplement, Index*, etc. (Springfield, Mass.: C. A. Nichols Publishing Company. 1924. Pp. xxiv, 8095–10855.)

THE World War practically occupies the last volume and takes a good slice out of the preceding. Quite a book in itself, it is carefully arranged, and each section is subdivided in detail. The military operations are emphasized in general, though there is a full section on the Diplomatic Background and there are copious illustrative documents (Kautsky, Austrian *Red Book*, Lichnowsky, Mühlon, etc.) and extracts from late publications of Fay, Ward and Gooch, Barnes, etc. The story as given, year by year, front by front, and then topic by topic, includes even the atrocities, auxiliary services, reconstruction, and costs of the war, closing with a long bibliography, a list of documents, and a "chronology". About fifty maps of various kinds assist the eye to an understanding of World War operations. There is quite a mixture of civilian and military references, of first-hand eye-witnesses and official reports, of large histories and small manuals.

There is, in these last three volumes, only one other feature to rival the World War in prominence. It is the United States, whose story fills half of volume X. and a third of volume XI., adequately supplied with maps, illustrations, and some facsimiles, and resting on the authority of nearly all the leading American historians of the past and present, together with extracts from memoirs like those of John Quincy Adams, and source-material like the *Old South Leaflets*. Third in prominence ranks Turkey, also sufficiently well supplied with fine maps, and an excellent bird's-eye view of Constantinople, pictures, a table, etc. Kheir-ed-Din Barbarossa's nationality and red beard are both more or less colored by legend (p. 8411). He plundered the Italian coast in 1534, not 1533. Strange results in spelling may be noted.

Sweden and Switzerland come next, the former bringing in Northern and Eastern Europe, and the latter, Zwingli and Calvin. Ulster and Ukraine each have a special interest: Texas also and, emphatically,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Venice and Wales. Tariff and Trusts are the leading economic topics. Besides a list of the treaties of peace, the Versailles Treaty, in somewhat abbreviated form, is followed shortly by the Congress of Vienna and also the Washington Conference. Woman's Rights and Universities and Colleges, Vatican, Wars and Warships, Westminster, etc., are among the topics one might forget to look for but would be glad to find. Likewise with the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A.

One must give a last sigh of regret that the biographical has been so much sacrificed. Such reading must be continuous, however, unbroken by excursions here and there throughout ten thousand pages. But the *New Larned History* is obviously for reference; it is not a novel, however interesting its parts may be or however skillfully these parts may be sutured together. Here the cross-reference system comes in. Between Scylla and Charybdis, between too much repetition of facts and too many breaks in the narrative, the editors have had to pick their way, pruning here, adding there, with results reasonably successful in the main. However broken the continuity, at least "the interrelations of history" have been shown.

As we observe how the additional space of this edition has been apportioned, we realize the new factors arising in the last quarter-century. The World War has inserted itself. Slavic history, Slavic biography, Slavic literature, even Slavic art have come measurably nearer to their own; the constitutions of Slavic states and other documents relating to them fill many pages. Topics unknown or comparatively unnoticed when the *Larned History* was young have become important: Women's Suffrage, Proportional Representation, League of Nations, Hague Convention, submarines, housing problems, and the like, throughout the whole wide range of the twelve volumes—to say nothing of everything relating to the air and radio.

It is now fair for us to examine the whole work in the light of the publisher's prospectus. That "the *New Larned* covers all history—political, social, economic, religious, scientific, literary, educational, etc.," is a statement within bounds—indulgently considered. These phases and fields are all represented copiously. More "history" is here than in many encyclopaedias and with writers of equal quality. One may pause before admitting that the *New Larned* will be always "ultimate authority". Yet "the results of modern scholarship" *have* been brought in to supplement *much* of "the best work of past writers", whatever exception we may take in individual cases or however much we may demand more exact references on important documents.

Certain errors of non-omission it was easy to commit, but it meant a failure to appreciate that "the years between" have modified conditions in many parts of the world. The flavor of the old "two-fifths" still lingers in archaic or superseded references, in descriptions showing the concept of Central Europe as German (or Magyar) only, in geographical

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expressions now obsolete. "Bratislava" we now call it, not "Pozsony" or "Pressburg"; "Cluj", not "Klausenburg" or "Kolozsvár"; "Dubrovnik", not "Ragusa"; "Ljubljana", not "Laibach"; and so on.

A supplementary index is in the last volume and a list of "works from which passages have been quoted in the *New Larned History*"; this latter reveals the multitude of writers consulted and suggests the enormity of the task undertaken. Few thoroughly sound authorities, in English, have not been consulted on some part of their special fields. The variety is increased, not merely by the addition of suitable publicists but also by the periodicals of the learned societies.

Slight typographical errors have been noted on pages 8101, 8104, 9055. Others have probably crept in among the myriad pages.

ARTHUR I. ANDREWS.

Human Origins: a Manual of Prehistory. By GEORGE GRANT MACCURDY, Ph.D., Research Associate in Prehistoric Anthropology and Curator of Anthropology in Yale University, Director of the American School of Prehistoric Research in Europe. In two volumes. (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company. 1924. Pp. xxxviii, 440; xvi, 516. $10.00 for the set.)

IN *Human Origins* Dr. MacCurdy has made available a convenient, authoritative, well proportioned and balanced handbook of prehistory, primarily cultural in scope but with due regard to the organic and geological factors involved, and covering the entire stretch from the first beginnings of genus *Homo* to the end of the undocumentary period of the Iron Age in Europe—to the threshold of history in the narrower sense, in short.

The first volume reviews the Old Stone Age and the evidence of fossil man. The second treats of the New Stone, Bronze, and Iron ages, with a long appendix summarizing the data "from every station that has more than one relic-bearing horizon". This appendix is not only invaluable for reference, but emphasizes the importance of cultural stratigraphy, the certainty of relative dating which it has achieved, and the significant fact, to which the author proudly calls attention on behalf of his subject, that there are virtually no more hiatuses in prehistory, at least in that of Europe.

The first chapter, which wisely is devoted to the development of prehistoric chronology, emphasizes the same guiding idea. There follows a chapter of sixty pages on the Ice Age, almost as difficult as most treatments of this topic are for the non-geologist—perhaps for the geologist also—but indispensable for sound construal of the placing of the cultural remains; and four chapters on the Eolithic, Lower, Middle, and Upper Palaeolithic, averaging about thirty pages each. On the vexed question of eoliths, Dr. MacCurdy is known as the first American champion of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these "near-tools", but his attitude is eminently fair, reasonable, and almost conservative. His Lower Palaeolithic includes only Pre-Chellean, Chellean, and Acheulian, his Middle the Mousterian. This grouping has certain advantages but is scarcely standard. There follow nearly a hundred pages on palaeolithic art, and then more than a hundred on fossil man. Volume I. concludes with a summary of the Old Stone Age, which is really a summary, not an interpretation.

Volume II., after a brief chapter on the Transition, opens with a long chapter on the Neolithic, followed with another in which the "Stone-Age Culture Complex" is treated as a whole—again in review rather than in synthesis. The Bronze and Iron ages receive somewhat briefer treatment, a hundred pages together. The volume concludes with a brief account of post-Pleistocene man in physical aspects; after which follow the appendixes—the one already mentioned, a "Repertory of Palaeolithic Art", and one on "Preservation of Monuments". The index has nearly forty pages of fine print. The two volumes contain over four hundred illustrations—well chosen, nearly all interesting, and splendidly executed.

"Chronology" in prehistory is of course a different thing from chronology in history. As soon as written records fail, chronological evidence is indirect, often tantalizingly scant, and its findings are essentially relative, and when absolute are usually little more than estimates. MacCurdy is excessively figure-shy, especially for the palaeolithic. Now and then something like a date has crept into a figure-legend, perhaps under publisher's coaxing; but MacCurdy's text for the pre-Neolithic era contains not even guesses. The nearest that the year-hungry can come to appeasing their appetite is by converting palaeolithic culture-periods into corresponding glaciations and interglaciations, and then trying to extract a consensus from the varying estimates of geologists as to the age and duration of the glacial periods as these are summarized at the end of chapter II.

Much more definite is the author's cultural-geological correlation. Here he follows the school which puts the Chellean into the second instead of the last interglacial. This is perhaps a minority opinion among specialists, but a sharper contrasting of the conflicting systems might have weakened the work's authority. The correlation adopted (pp. 84, 433) is: Pre-Chellean, first and second glaciations (and of course Interglacial 1); Chellean and Acheulian I., I–G 2; Acheulian II., third glaciation; Mousterian I., I–G 3; Mousterian II. (Neandertal) and Aurignacian, fourth glaciation, advance; Solutrean and Magdalenian, fourth glaciation, later phases.

This tendency toward stretching cultural beginnings far back is no doubt allied with the author's favorable acceptance of the claims for nostro-carinate flints, and other old horizons in England, and for the Piltdown finds. The latter get twice as much space as Pithecanthropus and Heidelberg man together, without quite attaining to a categorical valida-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. It seems a pity to build so much on contested evidence, as long as the uncontested yields a reasonably coherent interpretation. There is still some unconscious nationalism at work in prehistory—by no means confined to the British attitude in Piltdown. If more of the fundamental discoveries of the next decades were made by Dutch, Swiss, or Scandinavians, unanimity might be more quickly reached.

The material in the second volume is less closely co-ordinated than in the first. It is more complex and much more difficult to organize with sharp mental outlines. The author has substantially followed his predecessors in milling about among the interesting phenomena of the Neolithic and Bronze ages. Still, a step ahead, leading to a clean-cut classification, geographical and temporal, of the intricate data, would have been a service for which the world would have been grateful. Only one map falls into the second volume—and this is where distribution records are more needed than for the palaeolithic.

The treatment of the two metal ages is conventional in that it is really limited to the bronze and iron phases of the culture of the non-writing peoples of Europe. The data on Hallstadt and La Tène are well presented; but Hallstadt and La Tène are treated as domains of the archaeologist rather than of the culture-historian.

MacCurdy's book is based on a lifetime of genuinely hard study. It does not pretend to be inspiring. It is readable; and it is authoritative, exact, well proportioned, and will be extremely valuable as a work of reference. Its weakness is on the side of indecisiveness of judgment and fear of independent interpretation, a fear which is the more regrettable in that MacCurdy's very unusual learning, his quite obvious freedom from bias, and his invariable soundness when he does render opinion, all show that he might safely have ventured to trust himself farther. As it is, no reader who follows him will go wrong.

A. L. KROEBER.

The Character of Races, as influenced by Physical Environment, Natural Selection, and Historical Development. By ELLSWORTH HUNTINGTON, Research Associate in Geography in Yale University. (New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1924. Pp. xvi, 393. $5.00.)

SOME years ago, weakly yielding to the blandishments of an editor, I read Madison Grant's *The Passing of the Great Race*. That experience created the temporary illusion that I would never again read a book on "race". Afterwards, fortunately, I did read Professor Huntington's *Civilization and Climate*. If there are historians who think that all students of races are Nordic "fiends", I commend them to read that book; and then they should read the present work which is a kind of supplement and correction of the former one.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In *Civilization and Climate* Professor Huntington set forth the thesis that the distribution of civilization depends largely on climate, modified by migrations, racial mixture, certain inventions and discoveries, and certain ideas. Nevertheless, he says in the preface:

> I still felt that certain highly significant features of the distribution of human progress remained unexplained. Why for example did such meteoric intellectual brilliancy occur in Greece? Why has a high type of culture been able to persist for a thousand years in stormy Iceland? And why do we see in China the curious anomaly of a progressive South and a conservative North? After years of search I believe that at least a partial explanation is found in natural selection arising most frequently under the stress of over-population and migration.

The work is indeed no mere supplement. It is a broad survey of the history of the distribution of civilization in the world; but as an explanation of that distribution it does emphasize especially "natural selection arising . . . under the stress of overpopulation and migration"; and, from this point of view, the parts most interesting are those dealing with China and Iceland.

I have found these chapters, and indeed the entire work, fascinating and informing. I have learned a great deal, perhaps because I knew almost nothing about the subject. For the most part I find myself giving ready assent to the author's conclusions. This is due no doubt in part to the fact that he writes well, with the minimum of technical jargon; but chiefly to the fact that he avoids dogmatism, not being one of those who think that everything can be explained by one thing. But he does endeavor to explain things, and that is part of the fascination. Although a historian, I gladly run out to welcome any strange, interesting-looking generalizations that appear at the gate. I am predisposed to take them in; and Professor Huntington's lively crowd seem to me well worth taking in. Nevertheless, as they rush in and surround me with their cheerful and confident affability, I sometimes experience a qualm, a vague feeling of insecurity, which leads me to wonder whether it would not have been safer after all to have kept the gate locked.

This at least was the case when Professor Huntington came to deal with a subject with which I am somewhat familiar—the Puritan migration to America. He sums up the affair thus: "Many centuries ago there came to East Anglia some migrant Saxons, Danes, and Normans, *selected groups* of people, *uncommonly intelligent and competent*. At a later date many of their *most thoughtful* descendants became Puritans, a *second selection*. Then from the Puritans a *third selection* separated those *with special earnestness, determination,* and adaptability, and led them to migrate to America" (p. 326).

Here I stopped, noting certain pairs of phrases, italicized above; and upon reflection the following questions occurred. Are we to conclude that the Saxons and Normans were uncommonly competent because they

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were a selected group, or are we to assume that they were a selected group because they afterwards proved uncommonly competent? Did certain people become Puritans because they were most thoughtful, or do we think them most thoughtful because they became Puritans? Did certain Puritans go to America because they possessed special earnestness, or do we credit them with special earnestness because they went to America? That, among those who went to America, many weaklings perished, I have no doubt; but in so far as weaklings went to America, those who went were not a selected group—at least not in the sense meant. In 1630 the future of Protestantism looked dark indeed to the Puritans. Why not say that the easily discouraged ran off to America, while those with special earnestness remained to carry on the Lord's battle? Who knows how many timid and home-keeping villagers went to America because their friends and neighbors were being led off by a few heroic souls?

These are only questions. Professor Huntington's thesis is the old one of the "sifted wheat", presented many years ago to the American Historical Association by Charles Francis Adams. The phrase carries me back to an Iowa farm where, at threshing time, young boys used to catch up a half-handful of the sifted wheat and pop it into their mouths for purposes of mastication (with due precautions it made a kind of gum). But always, among the sifted wheat, were some grains, more or less as the case might be, of an alien character, round like the wheat, but black, hard, and extremely bitter to the taste. Among the sifted Puritan wheat there must have been, I have always thought, a goodly number of grains that were hard, or perhaps soft, but at all events black and bitter. I reach this conclusion by reflecting on the great variety of motives that determine the acts of men, whether they remain at home or go abroad. And I am confirmed in it by rereading a beautifully plaintive and pathetic and illuminating passage in Bradford's *History*:

> Men being to come over into a wilderness, in which much labor and service was to be done about building and planting, etc., such as wanted help in that respect, when they could not have such as they would, were glad to take such as they could, and so, many untoward servants, sundry of them proved, that were thus brought over, both men and women kind; who, when their terms were expired, became families of themselves, which gave increase hereunto. An other and a main reason hereof was, that men, finding so many godly disposed persons willing to come into these parts, some began to make a trade of it, to transport passengers and their goods, and hired ships for that end; and then, to make up their freight and advance their profit, cared not who the persons were, so they had money to pay them. . . . So also there were sent by their friends some under hope that they would be made better; others that they might be eased of such burthens, and they kept from shame at home that would necessarily follow their dissolute courses. . . . And by this means the country became pestered with many unworthy persons, who, being come over, crept into one place or other.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After due consideration, I do not advise locking the gate against Professor Huntington's generalizations; but once inside the garden, some of them, as they nose about the shrubbery, will bear a little watching.

CARL BECKER.

History of Political Thought. By RAYMOND G. GETTELL, Professor of Political Science in the University of California. (New York and London: Century Company. 1924. Pp. xi, 511. $3.75.)

THE subject of this book is "political thought" as distinguished from political institutions, which are to only a limited extent an embodiment of it. It does not deal, therefore, with the history of governments but with ideas relating to government, whether they have been incorporated in practice or not. The history of political thought, the author thinks, is justified by the fact that "in order to understand the past, one must know not only what men did, but also what men believed and what they hoped for". We have in this volume then an account of human beliefs and hopes about government; both of ideals that were realized and of phantasies that were incapable of realization. Aspirations and delusions take their place in the record along with the changes in practice which we are accustomed to call "progress".

In his preface Professor Gettell differentiates his work from the writings of the late Professor Dunning, which he characterizes as "rather a survey of political literature than a history of political thought in relation to its historical, institutional, and intellectual background", by emphasizing the need of supplying these deficiencies. It is from the point of view of thought, rather than from that of literature, that the present writer has approached his task.

This book undertakes to cover the whole subject, from the origin of political thought to tendencies in present thought, in a single volume of less than five hundred pages of text.

The first chapter, on the Nature of Political Thought, presents the author's views on the origin of political thinking, its relation to political institutions, its problems, the sources of our knowledge regarding it, and its value. On this last point he considers the objections that have been raised to reliance upon any form of political philosophy, its alleged futility in practice, and the reserve which is necessary to avoid danger in accepting political dogmas.

Intelligent men [he concludes] naturally wish to understand the authority under which they live, to analyze its organization and its activities, and to speculate concerning the best form of political existence. The fact that many of the greatest thinkers of all time—Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, Locke, Rousseau, Kant, Mill, and others—were concerned with the political aspects of philosophy is an indication of its importance as a form of intellectual effort.

The substance of Professor Gettell's book is "thought", but it is thought as affected by circumstances of time, place, and stages of intellectual development, and not for the most part pure speculation.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The most universal and striking feature of early political thought", he says, "was the failure to differentiate religion, custom, and law." As this history demonstrates, political progress has consisted largely in distinguishing between things that differ and assigning to each its own proper place and function. Note, for example, the immense forward step that was taken when the total separation between church and state occurred; or, again, when legislation began to modify and ameliorate custom. And the chief political problems of the present day resolve themselves into the question, What are the proper functions of legislation? How far, for example, should legislation busy itself with the means of livelihood and the personal habits of the people?

It is fitting that the last chapters of this volume should relate to the Rise of Socialistic Political Thought and the new conceptions of the nature and limitations of the state. This it does with considerable detail. Pluralistic Theories of Sovereignty, Recent Proletarian Political Thought—including anarchism, syndicalism, guild socialism, and Bolshevism—are analyzed and described.

In stating the various phases of thought considered in this volume, the author has not chosen to sit in judgment upon the doctrines stated. As becomes a historian, he has endeavored to present these doctrines and projects objectively, leaving criticism to others. So far as the present reviewer has observed, this presentation has been made clearly and impartially; and, considering the extent of the ground covered and the limits of space at his disposal, he is to be felicitated upon the success of his efforts.

Everything has been done that could be expected in a work of this compass to give value to it as a work of reference. The bibliography, offered under the modest designation of "Select References" at the end of each chapter, is sufficient for its purpose, though far from being exhaustive, and there is an adequate index.

If one can possess but a single work on this subject, this volume is a good one to own.

DAVID JAYNE HILL.

A History of Political Theories, Recent Times: Essays on Contemporary Developments in Political Theory. Contributed by Students of the late WILLIAM ARCHIBALD DUNNING, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D., Lieber Professor of History and Political Philosophy in Columbia University. Edited by CHARLES EDWARD MERRIAM, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Science in the University of Chicago, and HARRY ELMER BARNES, Ph.D., Professor of Historical Sociology in Smith College. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1924. Pp. xii, 597. $2.25.)

THIS volume is a collection of chapters written by students of the late Professor W. A. Dunning, who did more than any other person to

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stimulate interest in political theory in this country. It has a double purpose: first, to enable a number of men to contribute a memorial to a beloved teacher; second, to bring to date the three volumes of *Political Theories* in which Professor Dunning had traced the development of political thought to the middle of the nineteenth century. The first aim interferes somewhat with the second, resulting in a certain lack of proportion, a considerable amount of repetition, a decided unevenness in quality, and the inclusion of some material that scarcely qualifies as political theory.

The preface gives a brief biography of Professor Dunning. In an introductory chapter C. E. Merriam outlines the general tendencies of recent political thought. The section entitled "Actual Progress in Political Speculation" is excellent. Among the most important factors that influenced political thinking he mentions (1) the contact of diverse races and nationalities, (2) the development of industrialism, (3) the growth of cities, and (4) the rise of feminism. It is somewhat disappointing to find that no attention is paid in the following chapters to the third and fourth of these topics. The chief weakness of the volume as a discussion of contemporary political thought is the lack of attention to important theoretical aspects of practical politics. Professor Merriam suggests the importance of present-day efforts to reconcile democracy and efficiency, but no consideration is given in the chapters that follow to the ideas underlying the initiative and referendum, the direct primary, the short ballot, the reform of the civil service, the city manager, the growth of administrative boards, and the organization and functions of political parties.

Professor Dunning's earlier volumes gave chief attention to the literature of political theory and to its historical, philosophical, and legal background. He did not appreciate the importance of economic factors, nor did he recognize the change in point of view that was resulting from the contributions of anthropology, sociology, and social psychology. The volume under review is strongest where Dunning was weakest. The economic influence is recognized in F. W. Coker's chapter on Pluralistic Theories, and in P. H. Douglas's excellent treatment of Collectivism, Anarchism, Syndicalism, Guild Socialism, Consumers' Co-operation, Agrarian Distributivism, the Single Tax, and Bolshevism. The sociological influence is somewhat overemphasized. Almost one-third of the volume is given to chapters by Professors Barnes, Goldenweiser, Thomas, and Hankins, dealing with the contributions of sociology to political theory, the anthropological theories of political origins, the contributions of anthropogeography to political theory, and the importance of race. Much of this material has little direct relation to political theory.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The political implications of recent movements in philosophy and psychology are discussed by H. W. Schneider and C. E. Gehlke. They indicate the influence of the new philosophical and psychological conceptions on such issues as monistic *versus* pluralistic sovereignty, the relations between individual and state morality, and the nature and value of democracy. It seems somewhat inadequate, however, to relegate the connection between pragmatic philosophy and such writers as Duguit and Laski to a mere foot-note (p. 335). The various forms taken by the pluralistic attack upon the state are more adequately discussed by Professor Coker. Excellent chapters are those by M. M. Willey, in which he discusses recent critics and exponents of the theory of democracy; and by E. M. Borchard, in which he shows the obstacles which the political theory of sovereignty has placed in the way of international law and organization. The chapter on the political theory of jurisprudence by C. P. Patterson, evidently influenced by the lectures of Dean Pound, gives adequate attention to the sociological jurists, but ignores important aspects of recent legal theory, especially in Germany. The work of Esmein in France is not even mentioned.

As a whole the volume makes a decided contribution to the study of political doctrines. It outlines the wide range of interests included in present political theory and the valuable contributions that are being made by allied fields of knowledge. It suggests the importance of recent attacks upon the state and upon democracy. It discusses the interesting experiments now being made in the effort to readjust the organization of the state to correspond to the growing importance of economic groups. Valuable reference material appears at the end of the chapters and in foot-notes. A useful index, which includes the three earlier volumes of Dunning, is appended.

RAYMOND G. GETTELL.

Blockade and Sea Power: the Blockade, 1914–1919, and its Significance for a World State. By MAURICE PARMELEE, Ph.D. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1924. Pp. x, 449. $3.00.)

IF "blockade" were used in a popular sense to cover the interdicts of trade with the Central Powers which the Allied Powers forced upon neutral states adjacent to Germany, it would not be necessary to quibble over the title of this book, but the author evidently intends to examine these measures from the point of view of the law of blockade. For example, Mr. Parmelee speaks of "the belligerent right of blockade" being "carried to the uttermost limit in applying the rights of visit and search and of the capture and confiscation of contraband of war" (p. 11).

That the measures applied in the late war could not be regarded as blockade was indicated by the care the Allied Powers took to refrain from any notification of blockade (*cf.* pp. 38–39). The able jurists of the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Allied foreign offices well knew that a blockade could not be applied to neutral states. Instead of blockade the Allies applied what might be called the doctrine of ultimate consumption, by which they in fact interdicted the shipment to neutrals not only of goods really intended for the Central Powers, but also of any commodities which would have the effect of releasing within the neutral state other commodities for export to the Central Powers. In the search for fundamental principles of international law to cover these measures the jurist can trace no evolution from the principles of neutrality as expressed in the law of blockade, contraband, and unneutral service, but must justify them either upon the ground of reprisal for the illegal acts of Germany or else upon the theory that the Allied Powers had the right to compel neutral states to co-operate in their action against the Central Powers. The first theory is broad enough to cover every act and the second would recognize the small neutral powers as constrained to co-operate within limits fixed by the Allied Powers in their action against the Central Powers.

If Mr. Parmelee lacks the science to discuss the law of blockade, as chairman of the Rationing and Statistical Committee of the Allied Blockade Administration he had exceptional opportunities for gathering first-hand information of what actually took place. He has used the data which he collected to prepare a useful and readable account of the facts incident to the organization, evolution, and extension of the so-called blockade.

Perhaps most interesting of all are the pages devoted to the description of the situation when the coming of the Armistice found these trade prohibitions in full operation without any adequately prepared plans for their termination. The merchants and exporters of every country made themselves heard immediately in clamoring for a speedy removal of these restrictions.

It was, however, [Mr. Parmelee explains,] impossible for the Associated Governments to remove the restrictions involved in the blockade at a single stroke. When the Armistice was signed a very complicated situation faced the blockade authorities.

In the first place, the terms of the Armistice provided that the blockade of the Central Powers should continue during the period of the Armistice. Second, the reconstruction of the devastated regions required special attention, and a certain amount of regulation had to be retained in order to make it possible to give priority to the victualling of these regions. Third, the Associated Governments wished to control the victualling of the Central Powers as well. If restrictions upon import into the border neutrals had been removed at once, much of the victualling of the Central Powers would have taken place through these neutral countries. This would have furnished these neutrals an excellent opportunity to make large profits out of the Central Powers. It was to the interest of the Allies to retain control, for a time, of the trade of the Central Powers, in order to gain whatever profits were involved, and thus reimburse themselves in a small measure for the cost of the war. A fourth

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consideration which might have played a part was to retain some of the regulation of trade which had developed during the war as a part of the economic organization of the proposed League of Nations. But this consideration had very slight influence upon the blockade authorities in relaxing the blockade (pp. 175–177).

The second part of the volume is devoted to a discussion of the author's own particular brand of Utopia, a World State which—it is argued—will provide a panacea for existing ills. But this World State can not be achieved until our present capitalistic state organization is replaced by a true democracy (p. 322; *cf.* pp. 330–338). It will be necessary furthermore to do away with absolute sovereignty, with all national armaments beyond what is necessary for police duty, and with discriminatory economic measures between nations (pp. 320–329). Incidentally the existing League of Nations is discussed and measured in terms of these four prerequisites for a real World State. Tried by these standards the League is in each case found wanting. As Mr. Parmelee somewhat passionately remarks: "... the League ... falls very far short of being a genuine international state. It must first of all free itself from its degrading servitude to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and their pernicious instrument, the Treaty of Versailles" (p. 349).

While students of the war must be grateful that Mr. Parmelee has published this valuable information relative to the facts of the maritime operations in restraint of neutral commerce, they will regret that he has so encumbered and interwoven his contribution with subjective reflections.

ELLERY C. STOWELL.

The Cambridge Ancient History. Edited by J. B. BURY, F.B.A., S. A. COOK, Litt.D., F. E. ADCOCK. Volume II. *The Egyptian and Hittite Empires to c. 1000 B. C.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1924. Pp. xxv, 751, iv. 35 s.)

THE appearance of this second volume must be even more gratefully received than was the first, for in the interval many have had a happy experience of the value of its predecessor. Yet this must be accompanied by a formidable list of additions and corrections, incorporated already in the second edition of volume I. A disproportionate number of these repentances belong to Professor Langdon, who is commonly far too sure of his results, but even in their correction or withdrawal is quite equally dogmatic in the assertion of those which are to supplant them. I make so bold as to counsel caution in the acceptance of much that is new in the list of corrections.

This second volume sweeps a wide field geographically, historically, and chronologically. Its chief subjects are the Egyptian and Hittite empires to *ca.* 1000 B. C., but, as will shortly appear, these are far from

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exhausting its points of interest or of instruction. In such comment as the necessary limitations of space will here permit it seems well first to mention the discussion of the Hittites. Very far and very swiftly have we travelled since Wright first dared to mention a Hittite empire, only to be greeted *magno cum risu* on the Continent. Now it may be truthfully said that "The power and extent of the Hittite Empire is the most conspicuous fact in the history of the second millenium that has emerged from the research of the last half century". It is D. G. Hogarth, admirably qualified alike in knowledge and in temperament, who has here written of this great people, though P. Giles has also useful contributions to make to their racial description. The long sweep of Egyptian history is here contributed by James H. Breasted, than whom no man living is better fitted for a task so important. It is interesting to observe that departures from positions already taken in his well-known *History of Egypt* are relatively unimportant. Advance in our knowledge of Egyptian history has recently been far less rapid than popular excitement has supposed. I have only one exception to take to all that Breasted has here done. I am not convinced that Ikhnaton, "the Religious Revolutionary", is a figure of anything like the stature here portrayed. Here is he described as "the most remarkable of all the Pharaohs, and, we may even say, the first *individual* in human history" (p. 109). This judgment is based upon an estimate of the importance of the religious revolution the beginning of which Breasted locates when the king was "perhaps not yet nineteen". This is attaining a dazzling importance very early in life, and even though Sethe should prove better advised in setting the king's accession at twenty-five or twenty-six years of age, it seems highly improbable. Inferences theological and religious drawn from the famous hymn seem to me much overdrawn. Let us maintain our souls in moderate patience, and this king will probably take a much lower rank when we get the perspective adjusted.

The chapters on Israel are done by Stanley A. Cook, which is another way of saying that nothing in the literature of the subject has escaped attention. The attitude is distinctly modern, the methods of the most advanced historical and literary criticism are upon every page, and the spirit of William Robertson Smith rules the issue. It is his dictum that stands at the front: "the O. T. does not furnish a history of Israel, though it supplies the materials from which such a history can be constructed" (p. 352). This is quite true, as is also Cook's own observation with reference to the "critical" position that "no alternative position and no other fruitful lines of enquiry have attracted serious attention" (p. 356, note 1). It is so easy as well as so amusing for opponents to pick flaws here and there in Wellhausen or somebody more or less like him that the unthinking forget that no alternative yet exists. Nevertheless it is our business to take these critically sifted materials and make a history of them, and herein Cook is far less successful than in unravel-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ling strands of fact out of didactic Biblical books. He is hard reading, very hard, and I wonder what the uninitiated will make out of some of these pages of really learned effort. It pleases me much that he accepts, however cautiously, a descent into and exodus from Egypt (p. 358), applying it, of course, only to a portion of the Hebrew people (p. 360), though he does not make, as I believe he might, an interesting story of the episode. He is really overcome by detail, learned, exact, accurate, but lifeless. However, the conclusion of the whole matter is sound as a nut and quite as sweet. Here it is: "Truth of idea rather than of fact is the characteristic feature of the biblical history" (p. 406). He who has fathomed that and can use it intelligently will find his way.

There are no greater chapters in this big volume than XVII., the Achaeans and the Trojan War, and XVIII., Homer, both by no less a person than J. B. Bury himself. They might be called a return to sanity and sobriety of thought. The old and wildly excessive skepticism once regarded as the hall-mark of scholarship is gone, and Homer, *in propria persona,* has returned among men. The unity of both Iliad and Odyssey is quietly maintained, and to one man is their authorship ascribed. "The age of Homer was hardly later than the middle of the ninth century" (p. 507). "If we admit the single authorship of each of the epics, it is difficult not to ascribe both to Homer. If there had been two poets equally great, the names of both would surely have been remembered" (*ibid.,* note 1). Incidentally Bury disposes of the latest of the disjunctive hypotheses propounded by Wilamowitz-Möllendorff very quietly and effectively. There has been a sort of Wilamowitz-Möllendorff cult pretty widely disseminated and I rejoice in the evidence that Bury was unaffected. We may safely learn from the distinguished German Hellenist without making him an oracle.

As to the rest of this volume there is less to be said, though it deserves more attention than here may be given it. R. Campbell Thompson, who did so much and so well in volume I., here has only one chapter on Assyria, dealing chiefly with early kings such as Ashur-uballit (1386 B. C.), Enlil-nirari (1368), Shalmaneser I. (1276), and Tiglathpileser I. (1115 B. C.), but it is a dull catalogue of names and deeds, and his imagination was not kindled even by the last named.

There! What more is to be said than that this volume is better than the first and deserves wide acceptance? Its bibliographies are exceedingly well done. All its apparatus for study is admirable. No such handbook in German or in French can bear comparison with it. Well may we look forward eagerly to volume III. next summer, and at the same time a volume of plates for volumes I. and II. May the day hasten.

ROBERT W. ROGERS.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Caliphate. By Sir THOMAS W. ARNOLD, C.I.E., Litt.D., Professor of Arabic, University of London School of Oriental Studies. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. 223. 10 s. 6 d.)

THERE can be no question as to the timely character of this book. Round the nature of the caliphate, its origin, its past history, its situation to-day, and the present trend of its development, toward change or extinction, centre the most essential questions of the Muslim world of our time. And at this time, too, a great deal of that history, both as to constitutional theory and as to events, has at last been brought into clarity. Students of the constitutional theory of Islam have always known that the so beloved pope-caliph analogy was entirely false and that the caliph was only the administrator or executive of the system of Islam, both on the lay and on the religious side, having no authority whatever as to the formulating of that system. But the place of the caliphate in Turkish constitutional thought and the rise, assisted by Turkish diplomacy, of the pope-caliph idea in the West have been made clear only in the last five or ten years. It is true that even yet the part played among the Turks by this title and office and by the circle of ideas connected with it is not entirely clarified and Professor Gaudefroy-Demombynes's *La Syrie à l'Époque des Mamelouks,* with its long and invaluable introduction on the political and administrative organization of the Mamlūk state, appeared too late to be used by Sir Thomas Arnold. It would have illuminated not only the status and various haps of the caliphate under the Mamlūks but also the relationships of the sultanate, the caliphate, the bureaucracy, and the army, as we find these in conflict in the Turkey of to-day.

With this whole history Professor Arnold endeavors to deal in fourteen chapters and five appendixes. Naturally the connecting thread through it all is the history of the Abbasid caliphate, at Baghdad and in Cairo, with its echoes and imitations throughout the Muslim world, and the abiding and still existing memory and ideal which it bequeathed to all Islam. These Abbasid caliphs had been in relations of one kind or another with other Muslim princes; these relations had varied from suzerainty to practical equality. Sometimes there could be no relations between these rivals, because each regarded the other as a schismatic. Thus the regnant sharifs of Morocco have no interest in the present dispute. They have been caliphs in their own right since 1544 formally, and implicitly from the beginning. It is thus an exceedingly tangled skein which this book unravels and it may be said that Professor Arnold has been quite fairly successful on the external and historical side of his task. Further, the narrower and more specific problem of the book is to determine the nature of the relationship between the Ottoman sultans and the Abbasid caliphs, if there ever was any, and when, where, and to

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what extent the Ottoman sultans have connected themselves with the theory of the caliphate and served themselves as heirs on the historical caliphs.

Professor Arnold devotes one chapter of seven pages to the exposition of the canon lawyers and another of eight to philosophizings on the subject by ethical, mystical, and communistic writers. The latter chapter gives interesting speculations going back in part to Greek theories of government and showing the drifts of thought current among the intellectuals of Islam. But the inadequacy of the first brings out the weakest side of the book. The canon lawyers and constitutionalists of Islam can not safely be neglected as mere theorizers. That, if it needed proof, has been made very plain by Professor Gaudefroy-Demombynes's introduction, to which reference has already been made. There we see the bureaucracy of Islam, often hereditary and consisting in its personnel of these same canonists, functioning as the steel framework of the Muslim state. We see, too, the Shaykh al-Islam, hitherto supposed to have been an Ottoman creation, already existing as the head of the permanent staff of officials. This may be further illustrated. At the beginning of chapter XI. it is shown that the Ottoman sultans referred their caliphate directly back to God and not to the Prophet, that is, they were vicegerents of God in the earth and not of Muhammad. But that is precisely one of the points which the canonists discussed from the beginning. They asked: Was the phrase, "Caliph of Allah", allowable, or only "Caliph of the Prophet"? Again, the canonists discussed in detail whether there could be two caliphs at the same time, and some of them, from the very nature of the caliphate, decided that there could. Again, Muslim constitutional law permits a caliph to nominate his successor. That nomination does not come into effect until the first caliph has died and the nomination of his successor has been ratified by the Muslim people. Is not such an asserted procedure as this the basis of the Ottoman claim to having received the caliphate from the last Abbasid in Cairo? For it seems to be admitted (p. 22) that there survived in connection with the succession of each Ottoman sultan a ceremony in which the Shaykh al-Islam, as representing the Muslim people, "cast a ballot" for him and thus elected him as caliph. He succeeded to the sultanate as eldest male of the House of Othman, but he had to be elected in this way to the caliphate. How far back can this be traced? Professor Arnold does not tell us; does not indeed enter upon the point at all. But it is pertinent to his subject and fits into constitutional usage, as we know it. And a constitutional usage always preserves history.

Other criticisms are possible. Thus, against the statement on page 46, the tendencious character of many of the traditions was fully recognized by Muslims, and on pages 48 ff. the opposition of Kharijites and Murji'ites should have been more clearly worked out. But the fundamental criticism of an otherwise admirable book must be that, on an es-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentially constitutional subject, it is too simply historical and pays too little attention to legal theory.

D. B. MACDONALD.

A Knight's Life in the Days of Chivalry. By WALTER CLIFFORD MELLER, M.A., S.C.L. (London: Werner Laurie; New York: Greenberg, Publisher, Inc. 1924. Pp. xv, 300. 30 s.)

THIS book could well find its way into many public and private libraries as a valuable work for reference and "supplementary reading", if only it had been issued in a smaller format and at a more moderate price. As matters stand its circulation is bound to be limited, a matter which is a real pity, because it is a decidedly useful addition to our general reading books about the later Middle Ages.

Mr. W. C. Meller of St. John's, Oxford, is already known as an outstanding writer upon antiquarian subjects, and the present volume will increase his reputation both as a scholar and as an author, although the book leaves something to be desired in the way of orderly and convenient arrangement of its subtopics. In eighteen chapters he passes from the Origin of Chivalry (ch. I.) to the Decadence of Chivalry (ch. XVIII.), and from Armor (ch. III.) to Knights' Deaths and Obsequies (ch. XVII.). The strictly military life of the late medieval nobleman is described at great length on the basis of a wide and well-digested learning; considerably less attention, however, is given to the peaceful life within the castles, and still less to the religious and intellectual viewpoint of the knightly class.

Of course such a book is not a general treatise on "Life in the Middle Ages", and there are no chapters upon the lower classes of the population or on the secular and monastic clergy. Within its limits nevertheless the volume is a perfect quarry of information. For example, it would be hard to name any other modern book in which could be found a more comprehensive and accurate description of the life and training of "Esquires", than is given by Mr. Meller on pages 23–29, or of "Tournaments" than on pages 132–147.

An earnest and on the whole successful attempt has been made to steer a middle course between such writers as Gautier and Everard Digby, who "because the knights belonged to the Old Faith can see nothing evil in their lives and actions", and that "host of writers of the lighter literature who have followed far off the steps of Scott" and drawn their ideas of chivalry from the "merely spectacular and theatrical institution which it had degenerated into in the days of Elizabeth". However, perhaps a disproportionate amount of the information comes from the period following the breakdown of strictly feudal conditions in the thirteenth century, and it may be questioned whether the chivalrous usages were quite as interchangeable between France and England as is represented: there is, furthermore, no important study made of the institution of "chivalry" as it existed in Germany.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Meller will introduce most of his readers for the first time to the French ballads of Eustache Deschamps, otherwise known as Morel, whose long life stretched from 1328 to 1422, and who, if far less of a poet than his contemporary Chaucer, has left a great mass of verse-narrative which throws an extremely vivid light upon the details of the life of his age.

A Knight's Life in the Days of Chivalry is in short a book deserving a place in every college library and, despite its expense and unfortunate lack of page headings, subtitles, and a good index, a position also in the private library of every student interested in the life of the later Middle Ages in France and England.

WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS.

Les Rois Thaumaturges: Étude sur le Caractère Surnaturel attribué à la Puissance Royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre. Par MARC BLOCH, Professeur à l'Université de Strasbourg. [Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, fascicule 19.] (Strasbourg and Paris: Istra; London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. vii, 542. 30 fr.)

THIS work is especially concerned with the curing of the King's Evil or scrofula by the royal touch, but also deals with a number of other matters which the author regards as closely related thereto, such as the consecration of the king and more particularly the anointing with oil; the "cramp-rings", made of gold and silver, which had been offered at the altar by the English monarchs after "creeping to the cross" on Good Friday; the belief that lions, even when in a famishing state, would not injure their fellow monarch; the origin of the legends of the holy phial and the *fleurs-de-lis*; the cult of Saint Marcoul; the marvellous healing virtues ascribed to seventh sons, that is, to a seventh successive son without intervention of daughters; and the supposed powers of such groups of sorcerers as "the race of Saint Martin", and the relatives respectively of the apostle Paul, Saint Hubert, and Saint Roch.

The royal touch for scrofula was a monarchical occult virtue apparently limited to the kings of France and England. It was a later development than the ceremony of anointing the new monarch, which was introduced in the barbarian kingdoms of the West in the seventh and eighth centuries. Professor Bloch would place the origin of the royal touch between Robert II. and Philip I. for France, and in the reign of either Henry I. or Henry II. of England, rejecting the claims made for Edward the Confessor. Apparently it was connected with the development of primogeniture in the succession in both monarchies. In subsequent chapters Bloch traces the history of the rite, which was not identical in the two countries, to the close of the fifteenth century, during the period of the wars of religion and of royal absolutism, and in its decline.

This is not a pioneer book in the field, as on practically all the topics treated there has been a considerable amount of previous literature, which

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the author sets forth in a preliminary analytical bibliography. Many other interesting titles are noted in the course of the volume. But it may perhaps be called definitive, except that the author has not thoroughly examined the medical and magical literature of the long period during which the royal touch flourished, although he has a short section on "Le Toucher des Écrouelles dans la Littérature Médicale du Moyen Age". And he does not appear to have examined systematically the manuscript material, although he has made some use of manuscripts for certain phases of his investigation, as, for example, in utilizing the French and English account-books. But he appears to have quite thoroughly exhausted the printed material, and also gives an iconographic catalogue of representations in art bearing upon his theme. In manner the book is almost meticulously scholarly and lucid. A very elaborate apparatus of notes and appendixes is piled up; and in the text, in his anxiety to make everything perfectly clear, the author sometimes seems to become unnecessarily diffuse. His method is almost always strictly historical and not that of the sociologist or student of folk-lore.

It is interesting to note that Henry I. of England used the Lives of Saints for purposes of political propaganda, that the rite of royal unction was not introduced in the Byzantine Empire until a much later date than in the West, that the French came to be called "toads" (and then "frogs"?) by their enemies in consequence of a fourteenth-century legend that before his conversion to Christianity the shield of Clovis had been adorned with three toads which were miraculously replaced by *fleurs-de-lis*. I do not quite understand why at page 309 the author says, "With the modern epoch we meet, for the study of curative rites, a new category of sources: tales of travel, and accessorily, guides for travellers". Surely there were such books in the medieval period. The same date is given on page 403 as "le 31 mai 1825" and on page 404 as "le 31 mars 1825". The name of Evelyn does not appear in the index, although his very detailed description of the ceremony of touching for the King's Evil as performed by Charles II. is mentioned on page 376.

LYNN THORNDIKE.

Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names. Part I. Edited by ALLEN MAWER and F. M. STENTON. [English Place-Name Society, vol. I., pt. I.] (Cambridge: University Press. 1924. Pp. xii, 189.)

The Chief Elements used in English Place-Names: being the Second Part of the Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names. Edited by ALLEN MAWER. [English Place-Name Society, vol. I., pt. II.] (Cambridge: University Press. 1924. Pp. x, 67. 21 s. for the two parts.)

STUDENTS of English history have for some time been aware of the fact that a great deal of important documentary material lies concealed

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the British place-names. Various attempts have been made to exploit this material, with the result that English scholars now have access to a notable series of place-name studies, covering the greater part of England. Nearly all of these efforts have, it is true, been local in scope and interest, and the published results have not all reached the same high level of excellence. Within the last few years, however, plans have been in preparation for a systematic survey by competent scholars of the place-names in all the English counties. To promote this undertaking an English Place-Name Society has been organized under the presidency of Professor James Tait. The first volume of the publications projected by this society came from the press a few months ago. It is issued in two parts: the first is a "general introduction to the survey", the purpose of which is "to state the present state of our knowledge and indicate the lines along which the possibilities of future progress lie"; the second part (prepared by Professor Allen Mawer) is chiefly a catalogue, with brief notes of interpretation, of the principal elements found in English place-names. Of such the author has listed about six hundred and fifty, most of which are of Old English origin, though Professor Mawer has also found a considerable number (about one hundred) that seem to be derived from Old Norse sources.

Part I. is composed of nine chapters prepared "by scholars expert in the various fields of place-name study", each dealing with one of the larger fields or problems of the survey. The methods employed in place-name study are discussed in an introductory chapter by Professor W. J. Sedgefield. The author emphasizes the importance of searching out the earliest occurrence of a given name in the medieval charters and related sources. Where documents fail, the earlier forms will be determined according to the principles employed in philological research. The application of these principles is discussed by Professor H. C. Wyld in a chapter on "place-names and linguistic studies"; and their operation is abundantly illustrated in Professor R. E. Zachrisson's presentation of "the French element", a discussion concerned chiefly with the changes in the form of names that have come through French influence. A related subject, "the feudal element", is analyzed by Professor Tait, who deals almost exclusively with names that "arose out of, or at least reflect, the manorial system and military arrangements based upon land" that came with the Norman occupation. Professor Eilert Ekwall contributes two chapters on the Celtic and the Scandinavian element. It is the author's belief that "in some parts a British element must have survived for a considerable time after the conquest", living apparently to some extent in separate villages (p. 31). Professor F. M. Stenton has a chapter on "the English element" and another on "personal names in place-names". In the latter he raises the questions whether the Scandinavian immigration does not belong in large part to a period later than

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the time of Alfred, and whether Scandinavian influence did not retain its vitality much longer than is usually believed (p. 184). The interest of the archaeologist is outlined by Mr. O. G. S. Crawford in a paper on "place-names and archaeology". "We are gradually collecting facts in order to construct a map of England or of parts of England, as it appeared in past ages." To this undertaking Mr. Crawford believes that the projected survey will contribute in a large and important measure.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

A History of the English Prize Court. By E. S. ROSCOE, Registrar of the Prize Court. (London: Lloyds. 1924. Pp. xi, 115. 10 s. 6 d.)

THE title of this volume is somewhat deceptive. England has taken such vast spoil of the sea in recent centuries that some succinct account of what the prizes were, who took them, and where the proceeds went would interest if not profit a curious public.

Mr. Roscoe has not written concerning prizes; he has not even told how the Prize Court disposed of the goods and vessels before it or dealt with the tales of wild adventure or sordid knavery or both that so often lie behind a maritime cause. His little book, appropriately published by Lloyds and bound like a table of logarithms made to lie in a chart-room, is confined to the sober story of how and why a prize court began in England, its development, habitat, and personnel, the regulatory statutes and orders affecting it, and a summary of its work during the World War—a labor in which the share of Mr. Roscoe as registrar was very far from insignificant. It is the well-documented work of a proven scholar in maritime law; has required serious research among neglected rolls and records; and is well entitled to rank as the best and almost the only authority in the rather narrow field of legal history to which it belongs.

The point is clearly made and proved that the basic principle of all prize law was necessarily productive of a prize court of some sort; and that the kind of court that resulted was a natural product of the British habit of mind which insists on legalizing what it wants and usually finds quite lawful whatever is much wanted.

Assume the basic principle that all prize of war belongs to the sovereign, and all share thereof falling to captors is but the bounty of the crown to faithful (and useful) subjects, and it naturally followed that by special grant in advance to some known sea-fighter, or general permission to all who might be thereby induced to venture upon the waters, the king assured profits from captures to all who brought in enemy property. Equally did it follow that vexatious questions as to who was an enemy, or whether the property acquired with the strong hand belonged to that enemy or to some friend that had an ambassador at court, would

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theoretically come before the king himself, and had somehow to be decided in England at least as early as the thirteenth century. Evidences that officers of a judicial nature were employed to adjust these quarrels, and incidentally see that the rights of the crown were not impaired, have long been known, and they are well marshalled in this volume.

The sovereign improved discipline and saved himself trouble by appointing admirals not only for fighting but to keep order among the fighters, and the admiral's "deputy"—learned in the civil law—developed into an admiralty judge, and therefore assumed a jurisdiction in prize, which even Coke in his day recognized as too well established for appropriation by the common law.

The records of a real court adjudicating prize or no prize exist since about 1520, but it illustrates perfectly how comparatively recent is England's rise to maritime supremacy, that not until well into the seventeenth century did the court so free itself from executive domination as to act with the independence which even the Englishmen of that day recognized as characteristic of a proper court. That means that no public opinion and criticism corrected both executive and court, for not enough people were interested in what was being done.

Sir Leoline Jenkins, the admiralty judge of the Restoration, acting under warrants issued when hostilities opened, undoubtedly conducted a proper court, and by his ability and integrity made more of his tribunal than any of his predecessors; yet it required another century before both the Admiralty and Prize courts found in Lord Stowell a civilian who was also a good common lawyer, and as such a believer in case law, and he, instead of merely giving judgment orally in the seclusion of Doctors' Commons, permitted his written opinions to be published, thereby for English-speaking countries creating (the word is not too strong) a system of prize law, comprehensible by all and fair enough in the sense that neutrals could know beforehand how hardly they would be dealt with by the dominant sea power—which laid down the law.

As part of the Victorian law reforms, in 1864 the court ceased to be revived with every war and became a permanent part of the British judicial system; but in theory it was still the tribunal perfected by Stowell, and so remained as to procedure until the storm of war in 1914 showed even Stowell's methods as needing acceleration and adjustment to insure that neutrals should not transact business with enemies at radio or even steam speed while the Prize Court lagged behind travelling by sail. Almost over night, under the leadership of Sir Samuel Evans, pleadings were abolished and examinations *in preparatorio* deprived of all importance. Hearings in prize became investigations of which no one could prophesy the limits, and no wise man tried. Manifests, invoices, and marine documents of every kind might be perfect, but the new procedure paid small respect to them, if evidence from other sources indicated enemy ownership or destination.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not the least interesting part of the book is that containing the correspondence between the governments of Great Britain and the United States concerning this revolution in prize procedure, and the line between procedure and substantive law is often shadowy. There is a great deal in print on this subject, from Ambassador Page's letters up or down (mostly down), but nowhere is it better summed up than in this volume, where Mr. Roscoe substantially says, the Prize Court is our court, and we can make it or make it over as we please, and if you had been in our predicament you would have done what we did—and he might have added, if you dared. There is no reply to this, and it perfectly illustrates the whole history of the court; the rules of prize always incline in favor of the captor, but once made they do not in England vary without warning.

A statement of English business in prize during the Great War has been published elsewhere; the summary here found will satisfy and impress most readers. A tribunal that entered five thousand decrees and handled twenty million pounds was no mean adjunct of British power.

Mr. Roscoe has shortly but sufficiently treated the origin, rise, and use of a court peculiar and interesting; peculiar in that there is nothing else like it except in the United States, and interesting in that it has served national needs in a very national manner, covering with a mantle of fairness and legality what the parties injured find it difficult to distinguish from the "spoil" which the earliest English sea-fighters brought home to fight over.

C. M. Hough.

Histoire de la Nation Française. Dirigée par Gabriel Hanotaux, de l'Académie Française. Tome XIV. *Histoire des Sciences en France,* volume I. *Introduction Générale,* par Émile Picard; *Mathématiques, Mécanique, Astronomie, Physique, et Chimie,* par Henri Andoyer, Pierre Humbert, Charles Fabry, et Albert Colson. (Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1924. Pp. xx, 619. 50 fr.)

This superb volume of over six hundred pages quarto, illustrated, gives evidence of the reverence with which France contemplates her past achievements in physical science. And truly it is a magnificent record. Names like Descartes, Fermat, Pascal, Clairaut, D'Alembert, Lagrange, Laplace, Monge, Legendre, Carnot, Fourier, Poinsot, Poisson, Fresnel, Ampère, Barré de St. Venant—have to-day become household words and the long list must be crudely abbreviated to be given here at all. In the earlier nineteenth century, particularly, some of these names plumbed the remotest depths of physical science and connoted almost the whole of its progress. Probably no nation could have kept up that tremendous pace. No doubt the France of our century looks back longingly, visioning the dawn of an era of similar splendor. And it is just this which is hearten-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing. At the present day, when so much of the reward for scientific accomplishment is along lines sensed by political shrewdness and when the rigor of abstract judgment by which the merit of scientific men was formerly appraised has relaxed, it is a pleasure to welcome a chronicle of real achievement. France here gives a stimulating account of what she did and is now prepared to hear what others have to say in rebuttal.

Among the collaborators M. Picard, the present *secrétaire perpétuel* of the French Academy of Sciences, has been with us. He had charge of the French section of the St. Louis International Exhibit in 1904 and has addressed us elsewhere. M. Fabry made a short American visit during the war and quite recently spent some time to our advantage in this country.

The general content of the book is happily summarized by Picard, who does not hesitate to go back to the early utilitarian mathematical precepts of Chaldeans and Egyptians, intimating that even these were soon to lead to an abstract astronomy. The brilliance of Greek science, he thinks, should be treated as presenting not a discontinuity in progress, but rather a surprising acceleration. Nevertheless he fully appreciates the Greek tendency, however premature, to search for fundamentals—a procedure correct in method and which has become the invaluable heritage of science. With the decadence of Greek endeavor and the scientific stupidity of Rome, the rise of Arabian science and its eventual infiltration through the Pyrenees into France are in furtherance of the concept of continuity. France began early, with the inestimable advantage of annexing unclaimed scientific territory not only at pleasure but with the assurance that such territory is inalienable. One need not be surprised, therefore, at the breadth of the claims of present-day French historians. Thus one learns to know Buridan as the founder of dynamics, Oresme as a modern precursor of Copernicus, Viète as the originator of what we now call algebra, Fermat and Pascal as producers of the infinitesimal calculus. One may proceed similarly and cite, among others, Carnot as the creator of energetics and Ampère of electromagnetics. Astronomy is uniquely a French science and chemistry hardly less so.

There was a time when scientific credit was given only for actual demonstration. To receive a hearing the man of science had to prove his case either mathematically or by experiment. The tendency now is to treat with equal appreciation such apt suggestions of an earlier age as may be fitted into more modern doctrine, while conveniently ignoring the misfits. It is becoming increasingly popular virtually to canonize the greater men of science and to record their utterances as prophecy. Conjectures made from wholly inadequate data in the springtime of scientific endeavor thus often suffice to tarnish achievements of more recent investigators, logically deduced from evidence quite beyond the horizon of the early day. It is a convenience perhaps to pigeonhole the concrete advances of science in connection with a few great names (usually to the disadvantage of the more humble), but it is none the less idealized history.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The achievements of French mathematics, including dynamics and astronomy, are given by MM. Andoyer and Humbert in a scholarly presentation completed in 157 pages, throughout eloquent with French patriotism. The successive sections reach from the origins to Descartes, from Descartes to Cauchy, and from this great analyst to the present day. The history of physics due to M. Fabry is treated in 248 pages, the division being so far as practical into centuries. Of these the fruitful nineteenth requires 143 pages. The whole is clearly and charmingly written, frequently with a captivating enthusiasm. It is amusing, however (to cite one case of many), to find Huyghens virtually enrolled among French scientists because he spent some fruitful years of his life in Paris. Niebuhr, I believe, says somewhere that unless he touched Rome, the barbarian was liable to be left in the night of history. Possibly a similar function is to be ascribed to the Paris of Louis XIV. At least, the twenty-year sojourn of the great Lagrange in Berlin (to say nothing of D'Alembert and Maupertuis) would hardly suffice to enroll him among German scientists to the satisfaction of Frenchmen.

The story of French chemistry, finally, is completed by M. Colson with the usual topical arrangement in 182 pages. The presentation is able throughout, but too much in the style of a text-book, and this makes it difficult reading. Whenever the occasion arises, the names of French contributors are reiterated very much after the manner of a Wagnerian *Leitmotiv*. There is too subdued an appreciation of the chemical labors of "les étrangers" to suggest a well-balanced picture. Thus, for instance, the work of J. W. Gibbs, a giant among physical chemists, may receive less applause than a clever double decomposition devised by some compatriot. However, the presentation is throughout robust and expressed without ambiguity. One is obliged to congratulate the authors on the completion of their imposing accomplishment.

CARL BARUS.

Benjamin Constant: his Private Life and his Contribution to the Cause of Liberal Government in France, 1767–1830. By ELIZABETH W. SCHERMERHORN. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1924. Pp. xxiii, 424. $5.00.)

BENJAMIN CONSTANT was born in Lausanne in 1767 and died in Paris in 1830. During the last two decades of his life he was one of the most influential writers and ablest leaders of the Liberal party of France. It was during the Restoration, when the Charter, the Parliament, and the press were in constant danger, that his profound knowledge of the principles and practice of constitutional government and his courage and resourcefulness as a fighter for free institutions were of great and unmistakable service to his country. As deputy for the Sarthe, for Paris, and finally for Alsace, he expressed in word and deed that love of liberty which was the passion of his life, and devoted himself to "teaching representative government to France".

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But before that fruitful period of public life he had had a most varied and interesting career, literary, amorous, and political. His education had been irregular and cosmopolitan, at Brussels, at Erlangen, at Edinburgh, and at the hands of numerous, generally incompetent, and frequently scandalous tutors. He had come to Paris in the train of Madame de Staël in the early days of the Directory, had played a conspicuous part in the activities of the Constitutional Club, and had later been made a member of the Tribunate by Bonaparte, who shortly regretted his rashness when he saw Constant take his duties seriously and who consequently included him in that famous process of "creaming" by which that body was brought to conform more closely to the Consul's idea of elegant nullity. Later, in an hour of stress, after the return from Elba, Napoleon had appealed to this sturdy Liberal and brilliant pamphleteer to draft a constitution which should reassure the people of France that the reign of Despotism was not to be renewed, although a month earlier Constant had called him Attila and Genghis Khan. The Additional Act of 1815 was largely Constant's work.

Although much has been written during the past century concerning Constant, he has found no biographer until now. Special aspects of his character or career have occupied the attention of literary critics such as Sainte-Beuve, Bourget, Anatole France, and others. But Miss Schermerhorn is the first to have produced a comprehensive study of his entire life. Having chosen an extremely difficult subject, as well as one extraordinarily interesting, she has bestowed not only the most patient and exhaustive research upon it, revealed in little details as well as in the larger matters, but she has devoted much care and much talent to its interpretation and presentation. The result is a notable book, ample in its learning, rich in its literary texture, keen and delicate and sure in its psychology, mature and mellow in its philosophy. What strikes one most in reading this volume is the large and steady comprehension Miss Schermerhorn shows of her complex and scintillating subject. This gifted man of letters, this fervid, agitated man of sentiment, this dazzling conversationalist, this brave and progressive politician interests his biographer intensely but never leads her into exaggeration, never makes her his dupe, for she understands him thoroughly—his contradictions, his limitations, his blazing indiscretions, his weaknesses—and she never fails to discriminate between the theatrical, the emotional, the superficial, and the solid and sincere and significant in his attitude or utterance or action. She views him with an alert, cool, appreciative, amused, and penetrating eye.

It is an endlessly entertaining story, the life of this Swiss who was a true cosmopolitan, at home—and also restless—wherever he was, and who illustrates in characteristic ways the manners and customs and interests of the Old Régime and of the New. Miss Schermerhorn's portraits of persons, unimportant as well as important, are sharply drawn and of a

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wide variety. Her descriptions of the places connected with them—the petty margraviate of Anspach-Bayreuth with its sleepy, formal, and pompous existence, the court of Brunswick, Edinburgh, where William Robertson, the historian, and Adam Smith and Dugald Stewart were expounding their views of this and that and where he who became Sir James Mackintosh was a fellow-student with Constant and his friend, the town of Weimar, "the Athens of Modern Europe", the château of Coppet, whither Madame de Staël transferred the intellectual capitol of France whenever she was forced to leave the Rue du Bac, the boudoir of Madame Récamier—all these descriptions and scores of others are admirable and realistic. Significant features of the eighteenth century and of the early nineteenth, of the age of the Revolution and Napoleon, appear and recede as the reader goes on. It is a crowded and animated scene. So skillfully is the past restored, its persons, its passions, its peculiarities, its local habitations, and its names, that it seems to be the living present. Events also stand out, in similar saliency, as, for instance, Constant's breaking with Madame de Staël, adequately described by Constant himself as "the concussion of the universe and the upheaval of chaos".

Much art as well as much learning has gone into the making of this book. If the essence of good criticism is to find fault one might say that a larger treatment should have been given to the last fifteen years of Constant's life. But if this means that the earlier part would have had to be cut—one would regret excisions.

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

Essai sur l'Histoire du Parti Feuillant; Adrien Duport; Correspondance Inédite de Barnave en 1792. Par GEORGES MICHON, Docteur ès Lettres, Docteur en Droit. (Paris: Payot. 1924. Pp. xxviii, 526. 25 fr.)

THE work of M. Michon gives us more than the title promises. It is a biography of Adrien Duport, with an immediate background of the so-called Feuillant party, thrown against the larger background of the French Revolution; his treatment of this larger background, especially that of the year 1791, is more important, it seems to me, than his study on Duport and the Feuillant. For, after all, Duport was a second-rate character and in spite of his industry M. Michon found very little new source-material on his life. In the second place there was no Feuillant party and even the loose group to which that name has been applied had no coherent policy and no continuous co-operation that would justify the treatment of the group as a whole. Even in the smaller group, to which we might seem to have some right to apply the term "party", M. Michon has shown that there was a very serious divergence of views between Duport and Barnave. M. Michon makes it clear that Duport, from first to last, in spite of his apparent radicalism in the first year of the National Assembly, was at heart a conservative and more in sympathy with the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parliamentary opposition to the monarchy than with the more liberal movement that Mirabeau sponsored. This is nothing new, but M. Michon has demonstrated it, documents in hand, as it has not been demonstrated before, and that was worth while. In the second place, he has described in a detailed way the part taken by Duport in recasting the judicial system of France, a part for which his training had fitted him. His work as a member of committees and as a reporter in the National Assembly gives him a prominent place in this part of the activities of the Assembly.

The documents published as an appendix to this volume do not relate to Duport; they are the letters of Barnave. And in the narrative of M. Michon, after 1788, Barnave becomes a rival of Duport in the amount of space devoted to him. M. Michon could have said more about Barnave had he not rejected the Heidenstam publication, *Marie-Antoinette, Fersen, et Barnave, leur Correspondance* (Paris, 1913), as a forgery, basing his judgment entirely on the fact that the letters attributed to Barnave are evidently not in his handwriting. He takes this attitude in spite of the fact that Marie Antoinette states in one of her letters—clearly genuine—that the replies to her letters were written by "l'agent employé", who "écrit les réponses sous la dictée". A careful examination of the letters published by Heidenstam convinces me that we have to do with a case of incompetent and careless editing and not of forgery.

For me, the most illuminating thing about M. Michon's volume was his treatment of the first months of 1791. By the use of newspapers and pamphlets he presents that period as it has been presented in no work up to the present time, showing the rapidly growing conservatism of those who had been radical, the fear of the growing democratic spirit of the lower class in Paris, a readiness to make concessions to the king, and the adoption of a programme for the revision of the constitution that did not differ materially from the declarations of the king in the statement left behind at the time of his flight in June. This rewriting of the period before June, 1791, makes clear many things that were mysterious about the action of the Assembly following the return of the king to Paris. This is the part of M. Michon's work not promised in the title and, to my mind, more significant than what he has to say about Duport or about the Feuillants as a party.

A bibliography of sixteen pages is prefixed to the volume. M. Michon has certainly met the first condition of scholarly historical work, namely that of thorough research. In the list of sources are found manuscript materials from public archives (Paris and the provinces, Prussia, and Switzerland); printed documents, brochures, *procès-verbaux,* source-collections, correspondence, newspapers, *mémoires,* contemporary histories, secondary works, articles in reviews, and iconography. The list is not complete, but it is hardly worth while to mention the few items that are missing.

Fred Morrow Fling.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Historia de las Relaciones Exteriores de España durante el Siglo XIX.: Apuntes para una Historia Diplomática. Por JERÓNIMO BECKER, Académico Bibliotecario de la R. Academia de la Historia. Tomo I., 1800–1839. (Madrid: Jaime Ratés. 1924. Pp. 812. 20 pesetas.)

THIS book is the first volume of a three-volume work intended to cover the whole of the nineteenth century. It is based primarily, indeed preponderantly, upon the resources of the Ministerio del Estado at Madrid, and undoubtedly illuminates a great many of the highways and byways of Spanish foreign policy. It is most inclusive in its scope, dealing not only with the major problems, but also with many interesting minor questions. It is written, in the main, in a scientific spirit, with genuine detachment, and full realization of the deficiencies too often manifest in the Spanish foreign policy of the period.

On the other hand, there are certain general criticisms which may reasonably be made of it. It is to be regretted that in citing the diplomatic despatches the author has given only dates and names, and not the numbers of the *legajos* in which the documents are to be found. More important, Señor Becker's preoccupation with his sources has led him to neglect, in many instances, valuable material which might have given him wider information and a broader viewpoint. To cite an example, Baumgarten's *Geschichte Spaniens* contains much discussion of Spanish foreign policy, some of it based on Prussian archival sources, and all of which would have aided in the treatment of the period. Useful, too, would have been the great collection of Polovtsov, *Correspondance des Ambassadeurs de France en Russie et de Russie en France,* for the period 1814–1820.

In his treatment of the United States, Señor Becker sometimes deviates from the detachment which in general characterizes his treatment of his theme. The Monroe Doctrine he describes as "the hypocritical mask" behind which great ambitions were concealed, and its principles as "capricious affirmations having no validity except that of the force behind them" (p. 538). The neutrality policy of this country in the Spanish colonial struggle he qualifies as in defiance alike of treaties and of international law (*ibid.*). These observations hardly do justice to the motives or the logic which lay behind Monroe's famous declaration, or to the genuine efforts of his administration to enforce the neutrality laws in the war of Spain with her colonies. Curiously enough, with regard to this country's Florida policy, infinitely less respectable, Señor Becker has no word of censure.

To discuss the work more specifically, there is a stimulating and in some respects novel discussion of the Louisiana cession (especially pp. 76, 90, and 101); some valuable comment on the attempt of the British in 1811–1812 to mediate in the South American struggle (pp. 236–242); illuminating citations from the Onis despatches during the Florida ne-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gotiations of 1817–1819 (especially pp. 449 and 470); and an extremely thorough and painstaking discussion of the diplomacy of the Carlist war period, which consumes most of the last quarter of the volume.

Errors of fact are infrequent. From Polovtsov we may be sure of the non-existence of the secret treaty of alliance between Spain and Russia which Señor Becker surmises to have been signed (p. 405); the Amelia Island episode is inaccurately described (p. 460); and John Quincy Adams's famous despatch to Nelson, of April 28, 1823, is again cited, as it has been too often cited before, as if the United States feared the designs of France on Cuba, whereas the text shows clearly that American fears were principally directed against the British acquisition of that island.

In summary, Señor Becker's work is of value as a painstaking and in some respects suggestive study based on the Spanish sources in the Ministerio del Estado; and its reliance upon these sources is at once its strength and its weakness. It is certainly a book which must be taken into account by any student of the diplomatic history of the period.

Napoléon et l'Europe. IV. *Le Grand Empire, 1809–1812.* Par Édouard Driault. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1924. Pp. x, 424. 20 fr.)

M. Driault explicitly disavows undertaking a general study of the international relations of the period and confines his consideration to them in so far as they concern Napoleon. Such a limitation of scope inevitably results in an entirely inadequate and distorted view of the period as a whole. England, for instance, is almost completely left out of the picture, though its importance is recognized in the declaration that it furnished Napoleon such convenient pretext for many acts that if it had not existed he would have needed to create it (p. 202), and again in the outline of Napoleon's grandiose projects of 1810–1812 for naval construction to overwhelm England (pp. 365–369).

Rightly, M. Driault insists that the correct interpretation of Napoleon's policy, if not of the period, requires consideration of each item in light of the intelligence of the moment and not of knowledge of later facts and revelations. Napoleon formulated his policy with reference to the facts at his disposal; he knew not, as we do, the dénouement (p. 159). Napoleon was an opportunist (p. 27); his policy shifted with every change of wind; but he was of Mediterranean stock, his nature was Latin, his fundamental concepts were Roman; the essence of his dreams was not the empire of Charlemagne but the Roman Empire (p. 35). The Roman Empire must hold sway from Rome, hence its annexation in 1810, hence the title King of Rome for the heir, who in due season should (contrary to Sorel) receive Italy as his field of apprenticeship (p. 56), hence the plan for his own ultimate coronation in the Eternal City (pp. 60, 261–266, 418). The Roman Empire must, likewise, rule the East from

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Constantinople, hence the repeated evidences of his interest in the East, and hence, in the end, the inevitable conflict with Russia (p. 267).

Actually the Empire was at its height in 1810–1811; to Napoleon it was then still an empire in construction; to him the annexations and readjustments of those years were provisional, not final (pp. 195–196). Apparently M. Driault would not condemn Napoleon for failure to recognize the spirit of nationality but would discover his intention to afford to the several nations the fullest realization of their interests within his empire. He says explicitly (p. 23) that the empire is the most perfect organization for the realization of peace, obviously a new *pax Romana* for the whole of Europe and the Mediterranean basin after Russia should have been thrust back into Asia (p. 267). Surely it is interesting to speculate about the results had Napoleon consolidated the petty states of Europe in a single empire as the British did with the states of India in the nineteenth century—the areas and populations would have been somewhat comparable. The preliminary steps in such a consolidation Napoleon certainly took in Italy and Germany. M. Driault has admirably analyzed these two cases. His discussions of the Dutch and Spanish situations are less convincing but stimulate thought. He has no sympathy for Joseph, Louis, or Murat, and but little for Jerome. With impertinent stupidity they blocked the grand design, which was quite beyond the comprehension of their petty intellects and grasping dispositions. The divorce, the marriage with Marie Louise, and the birth of the King of Rome are all depicted in the dazzling light of the glorious imperial concept. Obviously the behavior of Prussia and Austria is presented from an angle entirely novel to those who are accustomed to think of it in terms of the "regeneration", but it is done with careful citation of the documents. Russia is reduced to the rôle of villain. M. Driault has produced a valuable, if not always a convincing, exposition of the Napoleonic ideas. Though frankly refraining from rewriting the history of the period, he has ably combatted some of Sorel's fundamental considerations.

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871. Von ALFRED STERN. Band X. (Stuttgart and Berlin: J. G. Cotta. 1924. Pp. xxi, 585. 15 M.)

THE chief interest of this volume of Dr. Stern's *History*, which extends from 1866 to 1871, derives from the revelations of the Vienna and Berlin archives. Napoleon told Metternich, the Austrian ambassador in Paris, that in the Luxemburg affair "Bismarck had been anxious to dupe him" (p. 97), and Eugénie was sure that "Prussia was trying to put France in the wrong" (p. 100): hence their desire that "Austria should resume her position in Germany". The first step towards a common policy was the meeting of Napoleon and Francis Joseph at Salzburg,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where Beust declared that Austria would uphold the Treaty of Prague, but would not join in an offensive war or offend German national feeling (pp. 125–126). By 1868 Napoleon, though "undoubtedly sincere" (p. 181) in his protestations of peace, admitted that war might come about, and he "desired to lift France out of her isolation and to be assured of the support of other Powers in all circumstances" (p. 184). He accordingly inquired of Francis Joseph whether their alliance should be "active" or "passive": he would "enter the conflict" if Prussia supported Russia in an Austro-Russian war over Rumania, but expected Austria to send 400,000 men to the Rhine, as against 200,000 to the Balkans (pp. 186–187). As Victor Emmanuel was ready to contribute 500,000 troops (p. 189), the treaty for a triple alliance was drafted on March 1, 1869 (app. 3, p. 541). It provided for an offensive and defensive alliance, mutual guaranties of territories, and action in common on all questions of compensations and territorial rearrangements, but Andrássy's objections reduced it to a mere "treaty of peace, alliance, and friendship" (app. 5, p. 542), the obligations of which were limited to "a common policy in diplomatic questions". A protocol, however, promised French and Italian support of Austria in a war with Prussia, and Italian compensation in Trentino and Nice, but said nothing of any gains for France. Bismarck declared that the rumors of the negotiations "do not disturb me in the least" (p. 194); rightly, for Italy demanded a "rectification of the Isonzo frontier" and the evacuation of Rome (p. 196), which were not conceded. So the treaty was not signed, and there was only an exchange of letters between the emperors, Napoleon promising to use "all the forces of France" if Austria were "threatened by any aggression" (app. 6, p. 544). Later, Ollivier said that the "good understanding . . . is much more solid and intimate than if it were a sealed alliance, for it rests on common interests and the necessities of the European situation" (p. 222, note). In June, 1870, Francis Joseph declared to Marshal Lebrun, "Above all I desire peace. I must be forced into war" (p. 224). When war came, the most that he and Beust proposed was armed neutrality, in alliance with Italy, as a step to intervention (pp. 362–363), a plan opposed by Andrássy and blocked by Napoleon's refusal to abandon Rome (p. 373).

For the preliminaries of the Franco-German war, the Berlin archives lead Dr. Stern to much the same conclusions as they have Professor Lord (*The Origins of the War of 1870*). Bismarck's object may not have been war, which is "not to be proved" (*unerweisbar*, p. 312), but "he could not have been unaware that a Hohenzollern kingdom in Spain would make bad blood in France", while he concealed from King William "his hope of making Spain, under a Hohenzollern, an outpost of Prussia in the south as he had done in the east with Rumania" (p. 307). He had set a trap for Napoleon (p. 313). At the beginning the latter wished to avoid any warlike threats, and Gramont and Ollivier, so Metter-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rich thought, desired only "a diplomatic success" (p. 319). Unfortunately the chauvinist chambers forced their hand; the empress, too, hoped that Prussia would not yield (p. 322).

Bismarck did nothing to make the situation easier. On arriving in Berlin on July 12, he experienced "a bitter disillusion, that the matter was about to be ended" (p. 338); but he was determined to have his revenge for the French declaration of July 6. The edited Ems telegram was "a much sharper version" than the original (p. 343). "The uninitiated reader must have derived the impression that the king, with a feeling of having been insulted, had shown the door to the representative of France immediately and once for all. This impression would furthermore be strengthened by the publication of the despatch not as a communication of the Foreign Office in Berlin, but as a direct expression of the king's wishes" (p. 344). It was the official communication of this despatch to foreign governments, which Bismarck denied in the Reichstag, that caused France to decide on war (p. 347); even then Napoleon angled for the mediation of Vienna and Florence (p. 348). Dr. Stern does not excuse the recklessness of the French government, but his long analysis clearly places the major responsibility upon Bismarck.

There is no space to comment upon the excellent chapters dealing with politics in Austria-Hungary, Germany, France, and Italy. It is to be regretted that this volume does not offer some account of economic and social developments after 1850, and that the index to volumes VII.–X. is to persons only. But all scholars will extend their hearty congratulations to the venerable and distinguished historian upon the completion of his monumental work.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

Western Australia: a History from its Discovery to the Inauguration of the Commonwealth. By J. S. BATTYE, Litt.D., Public Librarian of Western Australia. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. 480, plates. 25 s.)

THE appearance of the present volume, it is to be hoped, will serve as a happy portent of a growing interest in Australian history. Heretofore, the history of but one of the colonies, namely, Victoria, has received anything like adequate treatment. This splendid volume will go far to supply this primary need, so far at least as the youngest member of the Commonwealth is concerned.

Western Australia has been most fortunate indeed in her historian. Dr. Battye has given us a most careful and authoritative survey of the evolution of the colony from its discovery and early exploration to its incorporation in the Australian commonwealth. In the prosecution of his work he has taken pains to draw upon all the available documentary material to be found in the Public Record Office and the colonial secretary's

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

office in London, as well as in the archives of the colonial government and the files of the local newspapers. The treatment throughout is marked by scientific accuracy, clearness of expression, and impartiality of judgment.

The early history of the colony is a sorry record of struggling settlements, painful explorations, conflicting land policies, administrative squabbles, and troubles with the aborigines. To escape from the slough of financial depression the colony sold its birthright of freedom for a mess of pottage in the form of convict labor. The immediate economic results were undoubtedly profitable, but the colony was subsequently forced to pay a heavy price in the moral stigma which attached to the country long after the transportation system had ceased.

At first the administration of affairs was left almost entirely in the hands of the governor and the Colonial Office. But with the growth in wealth and population of the colony the political instincts of the race soon began to assert themselves in an agitation for a larger measure of autonomy and ultimately in the demand for full responsible government. But the Colonial Office as usual was loath to surrender its control over the public lands of the colony. In the end the British government gave way, and in 1890 the colony was granted a new constitution similar in character to that of the sister colonies. The following ten years are given up largely to the remarkable gold discoveries and to the federation movement which came to fruition in 1900 in the Commonwealth of Australia.

The political phases of the last decade have not been worked out with the same careful detail which was lavished on the economic and social aspects of the early days. The author has apparently felt that he was getting too close to present-day controversial events to express himself with certainty and entire freedom of judgment. Upon more than one important question he is strangely silent or non-committal. He has little or nothing to say about the influence of the native-born generation of Australians upon the social and political life of his country. The more recent developments of British imperial policy have almost escaped attention. To the gallant participation of Western Australia in the South African War he devotes but a single paragraph. And lastly, but perhaps most important of all, he gives but scant attention to the bitter economic struggles among the various classes—agricultural, industrial, and proletarian—which have played so large a part in Australian politics.

Dr. Battye has set up a high standard of scholarship for future Australian historians. We sincerely hope that he will see fit to continue his investigations and that his researches may stimulate other Australian scholars to undertake similar studies for the other states of the Commonwealth.

C. D. ALLIN.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Geographical Conceptions of Columbus: a Critical Consideration of Four Problems. By GEORGE E. NUNN. [American Geographical Society, Research Series no. 14.] (New York: the Society. 1924. Pp. vii, 148.)

THIS work comprises four separate studies, with the following subtitles: (1) The determination of the length of a terrestrial degree by Columbus; (2) The route of Columbus on his first voyage as evidence of his knowledge of the winds and currents of the Atlantic; (3) Did Columbus believe that he reached Asia on his fourth voyage? (4) The identity of "Florida" on the Cantino map of 1502.

As the author observes in his beginning, "One of the essential questions which Christopher Columbus was called upon to face in formulating his project for a westward voyage was that of the distance to be traversed between Europe and Asia." The length of a degree of longitude being known, and being divided into the known or estimated length of the known world from east to west, would give the number of degrees of longitude in the known world. The difference between this number and 360 degrees would be the angular measure of the unknown world, which converted into miles would be the distance to be sailed westward from Europe or Africa to reach Asia. That distance would be greater or less according as it was near to or far from the equator. Had it been practicable, Columbus would probably have taken it and measured it on the parallel through the Canary Islands, the line on which he eventually sailed, but on account of the inaccuracy, in those days, of observations for longitude and the comparative accuracy of those for latitude, the method used for determining the lineal measure of a degree of longitude was to determine that of a degree on a meridian, or degree of latitude, and regard it as equivalent to a degree of longitude on the equator.

The author's explanation of how Columbus undertook to do this (pp. 28–29) is unsatisfactory. We learn from it that he took Lisbon and Los Idolos Islands as the limits of his basic arc and distance, but not what precise latitudes he determined or adopted for these places. The author admits that the lineal distance between them as determined or adopted by Columbus is not known. He gives the result of the process as $56\frac{2}{3}$ Italian nautical miles (= 53.047 statute miles), having taken it from certain marginal notes in Pierre d'Ailly's *Imago Mundi*. He quotes these from the *Raccolta Colombiana*, and asserts, but does not prove, that they were made by Christopher Columbus. He does not touch on the question as to when they were made. As long as there is room for doubt as to whether these notes antedated the first voyage they are not acceptable as evidence on the process of preparing for it.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The chief value of the study is its exposition of the fact that Columbus made his measurement of a degree of longitude, not on the equator or a parallel, but on a meridian.

The second study establishes beyond reasonable doubt the interesting and important fact that Columbus based his first voyage, going and coming, on a knowledge of the general direction of the prevailing winds and currents in the North Atlantic. The author expresses the belief "that the identity of Columbus's San Salvador is not possible of definite solution today", and decides on Cat Island as the landfall. The text is admirably illustrated with a map showing the prevailing winds and currents and the track of Columbus going and coming.

In the third study the author complicates the question whether Columbus believed that he had reached Asia and weakens his answer to it, by bringing into his discussion, as a fundamental proposition, his unproved answer to the question: What was the guiding purpose or chief object of Columbus's four voyages? He shows that he is familiar with Vignaud, and so can hardly be justified, however he may differ with him, in completely ignoring what Vignaud has said against the theory that this object was the discovery of a westward route to India and Cathay. The text is illustrated with an old Ptolemy map republished in 1490, a map of Behaim's eastern hemisphere, the so-called Bartholomew Columbus maps, and a map composed by the author to represent "the Columbian Geography of 1502". The latter is based on the other maps, together with the one known map of Juan de la Cosa, reproduced in part in the fourth study, and the writings of Columbus.

The Ptolemy map, the Bartholomew Columbus maps, and the Juan de la Cosa map all represent the Indian Ocean as really or practically a closed sea. The Behaim map represents it as open. In his composite map, the author discards the first three of these cartographers to follow Behaim, not by any means more respectable as an authority. The only apparent reason is his adherence to the discredited, or at least disputed, theory that Christopher Columbus was trying to reach India. To entertain such a purpose Columbus must think of the Indian Ocean as open. *Ergo* he so thought of it. The double broken line on the composite map marked "Route Columbus believed he was following along the coast of Asia on his fourth voyage and continuation he had at one time considered following to reach India" may be regarded as more imaginary than real.

The writings of Columbus on which the author relies are one of the fore-mentioned marginal notes which he attributes to Christopher Columbus; the letter to Santangel of February 15, 1493, relating to the first voyage; and that of July 7, 1503, reporting the fourth voyage. The latter is the strongest ground in his position. Though he does not make the best use of it, he succeeds in repelling the attacks conjured up from Harrisse and Thacher and in gaining his object of establishing an affirmative answer to his original question.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fourth study, discussing the identity of *Florida* on the Cantino map, is perhaps the most valuable of these valuable contributions to historical geography. It is certainly the most creditable to the author's erudition, which is exhibited in a signal degree in each study and touches the top grade in this one. All that this essay needs is a clarification of one or two passages, to be perfect. It brings out the surprising fact that, in comparing the names on Cantino's continent with those of Columbus's supposed continent of Cuba, Harrisse gives the Cantino names in regular order from north to south and confronts them with Columbian names taken from an intermediate point northward and then from the same point southward. Of course he found them disagreeing. The author compares them in mutually corresponding order and finds that "a sufficient number of the names can be identified to establish a vital connection between the Cantino mainland and the explorations of Columbus on his first and second voyages". He concludes that the continental land northwest of Isabella was not Florida, but "was drawn under the misapprehension that it was the mainland of Asia".

The work as a whole is well planned and in general well executed. The quotations and references, in several languages, afford ample opportunity and excuse for errata, but with little effect. The errata are remarkably few. To mention one, the number of metres in a mean meridional degree, given (p. 17) as 111,121, is 111,321.

JOHN BIGELOW.

History of the American Frontier, 1763–1893. By FREDERIC L. PAXSON, Professor of History in the University of Wisconsin. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1924. Pp. xix, 598. $6.00.)

IN fifty-nine chapters, averaging a little less than ten pages to the chapter, Dr. Paxson has synthesized the considerable volume of material on Western history that has appeared in the third of a century since Frederick Jackson Turner presented his memorable paper on the "Significance of the Frontier in American History". The result is an admirable history of the West. Beginning with the narrow hem of settlement along the Atlantic littoral in the latter part of the eighteenth century, Dr. Paxson has traced carefully and with scientific precision the details of discovery, diplomacy, war, exploitation, penetration, and legislation that have extended the territorial limits of the United States to the Pacific Ocean, and that, by 1893, had added thirty-three states to the amorphous union of a century and a third earlier.

Of course the field is not new. Dr. Paxson has built on the foundations of others. Although he is careful to acknowledge his indebtedness to the pioneers, Parkman and Winsor, and to the moderns, Thwaites, Chittenden, Alvord, and Turner, his study is distinctively his own. As the ablest one-volume history of the West, this book is likely to stand,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the modest author in his preface to the contrary notwithstanding. As the most readable one-volume history of the West, however, it may have some competition. Possibly because of the minute subdivision into short and somewhat unrelated chapters, there is something pedestrian, a flavor of the class-room and the syllabus about the book. Austere as are the demands of modern historical scholarship, one could wish, in dealing with a subject of this kind, a little more of the spirit of the *Covered Wagon* and a little less of that of the *Congressional Record.*

Somewhat less satisfying is the book when viewed not as a history of the West, but as what it purports to be, a history of the frontier. Strange as it may seem, Dr. Paxson apparently forgets at times that the two are far from identical. "The American frontier was a line, a region, or a process, according to the context in which the word is used" (p. 43). As for the "line" aspect, two of the eleven good maps that accompany the volume are devoted to its portrayal. "The lines that can be drawn delimiting the zone from two to six to the square mile are frontier lines, that help the historian to fix his attention upon the frontier of any date" (pp. 44 ff.). Finding that pursuit of this aspect of the problem does not prove very profitable, the author properly makes little claim for the line concept. "As a *process*" (the italics are the author's), says Dr. Paxson, "its most significant meaning is found" (p. 43). Precisely. And yet from 1763 to 1893, he appears vastly more concerned with the history of the frontier as a region, that is, the history of "that area of the United States in which the frontier process was going on at any moment" (p. 44), than with the history of the process itself. To illustrate, chapter XXII. is virtually a gazetteer of Indiana at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Settlements at Lawrenceburg, Jeffersonville, New Albany, Corydon, and Evansville all find mention. But what were the good people of these parts doing? What were they thinking? How did they feel about the European war? What was their attitude toward the high price of agricultural products at the seaboard and the low price on the Ohio, and what did they propose to do about it? The author offers us no clear answer to questions of this sort. Or another illustration—the index lists Keokuk, Burlington, Davenport, Dubuque, and Des Moines, but has no place for Populism or Prohibition.

The frontier as a process clearly means the frontier as a state of mind, and it is fair to inquire under what circumstances the frontier psychosis appears and what its characteristics are. Dr. Paxson finds "isolation" (p. 95) and a density of "from two to six to the square mile" (p. 45) to be physical essentials of a frontier state of mind. Under these circumstances, we may expect to find, says he, "the distinctive American demand for a right to self-determination" (p. 7), "self-confidence of . . . thought . . . against a background of equality", an "equality of fact rather than of theory" (p. 96). "Self-confidence, equality, and the demand for autonomy were unavoidable conditions that

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the frontier bred" (p. 97). These are clear-cut theories as to the character of the frontier, and, if correct, they are worth sustaining. Unfortunately, however, Dr. Paxson can scarcely be said to have given us the equation of the frontier in terms of these co-ordinates. Rather, he accepts with but slight analysis these traditional notions as to frontier conditions and frontier traits. As a matter of fact, an excellent thesis could be sustained on the proposition that density of population has nothing to do with it, that many of our urban communities in the West savor more of the frontier than the rural communities, that *Babbitt* is a truer picture of the present-day frontier than *Main Street*. Or, again, there is much to be said for the contention that the frontier is dependent rather than independent, inclined to persist in the status of a ward rather than to assume the responsibilities of maturity, that when the National Highway needs repairing or the homesteaded land proves to be economically submarginal, the frontiersman is vastly more likely to run to Washington for legislation than to work out himself the solution of his own problems. Half the statutes of our Western states on really important matters of state administration and control are borrowed from the statute-books of other states. Inhabitants of cities of ten thousand with all the modern conveniences still complacently accept missionary boxes. Or, again, much can be said for the thesis that instead of being belligerent and even somewhat truculent, the frontier has always been essentially pacifist.

It is the reviewer's opinion that one reason why Dr. Paxson seems to have given somewhat inadequate consideration to the frontier as a process is because he has treated his subject as if it were a political entity; that is, he has undertaken to write the history of a social, economic, and political process as if he were writing the history of something fixed, something constant in space if not in time, the state of Wisconsin, for example. Fortunately, however, here and there the reader is vouchsafed admirable glimpses of actual frontier processes. The chapters on the Land Problem, Frontier Finance, the American System, and the Cow Country, are excellent, though brief. Somewhat less satisfactory are those on the Political Theories of the Frontier, Jeffersonian Democracy (which, despite Dr. Paxson's claims, remains the product of the doctrinaire rather than of the dirt farmer), the Far West and Politics, and Frontier Panaceas. Whatever this frontier process may have been, it is questionable whether "with forty-eight states participating in the union, the task was complete" (pp. 572 ff.). Frontier problems and frontier forces in the nation were surely not terminated by anything so artificial as admission to statehood.

"It would be a work worth the historian's labors to mark these various frontiers and in detail compare one with another." Thus wrote Frederick Jackson Turner in 1893. Dr. Paxson has marked them admirably, even if he has not given us their history with equal satisfaction.

H. C. DALE.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trade and Politics, 1767–1769. Edited with Introduction and Notes by CLARENCE WALWORTH ALVORD, University of Minnesota, and CLARENCE EDWIN CARTER, Miami University. [Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library, vol. XVI.; British series, vol. III.] (Springfield, Ill.: Trustees of the Library. 1921. Pp. ix, 760.)

THIS volume carries the story of British progress in the West through only three years. The field under review stretches from the Hudson to the Mississippi and from Michilimackinac to Florida, the centre being the Illinois country. No definite western policy had been decided upon and the government was still undecided as to the future. A number of schemes are suggested by the various correspondents, none of which seems satisfactory to all parties. Shelburne and Hillsborough represent the British government and are greatly concerned for the enormous expenditure for Indian congresses, and for garrisoning the western posts; Benjamin Franklin represents American interests and is also personally interested in land grants in the Illinois country; Sir William Johnson and George Croghan represent the Indians, continually on the verge of war on account of encroachments by settlers and traders; Morgan, Wharton, and Baynton represent the larger traders, interested also in provisioning the garrisons and directly opposed to the smaller English, French, and Spanish bushrangers; the small traders are concerned over the trade regulations which prevent them from dispensing liquor and restrict them to the vicinity of the forts; the priests are concerned over the general licentiousness of the traders and settlers and the difficulties of maintaining their church regulations; while the Spaniards, holding the best avenue to the western trade, are eager to advance their business interests on the middle and upper Mississippi. Altogether it forms an interesting and complex problem. The eastern traders are failing because of the high cost of transporting goods by way of Pittsburgh and the Ohio River. Hostile Indians cause heavy losses along the Ohio, while the Spanish practically prohibit trade up the Mississippi. The correspondence opens up a wholly new field. Immense mercenary hunting parties to Kentucky are described long before Boone "first of white men viewed that noble valley". In fact expeditions from Virginia to Kentucky are shown antedating Boone by several years. The mystery of the disappearance of the buffalo east of the Mississippi is explained. Even an expedition to the Falls of St. Anthony is indicated, though no details are given. An adventurous boatman writes of shooting the falls of the Ohio.

Settlements appear on the Monongahela, around Detroit, Kaskaskia, St. Vincent, and on both banks of the Mississippi as high up as the Missouri. Traders are stationed or operating at Vincennes, Terre Haute, Vermillion River, Ouiatanon, Eel River, Elkhart, and Fort Wayne in Indiana.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The documents vary of course in historical value and interest from almost nothing to important state papers and from mere personal gossip to high commercial and political ability. They have been gathered from at least thirty different sources and the omissions leave hope that others will be found later. No sport is more fascinating than chasing a fugitive document. Some of these have escaped the vicissitudes of more than one military disaster.

The editorial work is good, though the ordinary citizen would appreciate more explanations. The breaks between the documents are not always apparent and the confusion between superior figures and letters sometimes sends the reader on a hunt for a foot-note where there is none. The editor has succeeded in leaving out a vast number of (*sic*'s) and should have used none. It is generally understood that the spelling of a document is retained and there is no need of stopping the reader to tell him so. There are a few harmless typographical errors. The index is admirable.

LOGAN ESAREY.

The Evolution of American Political Parties: a Sketch of Party Development. By EDGAR E. ROBINSON, Professor of American History in Stanford University. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company. 1924. Pp. ix, 382. $4.00.)

THE subtitle of this volume indicates its substance. It is a summary sketch of American party history. It deals not only with party organization and leadership but with the various political ideas and issues that have been the subjects of discussion and conflict.

The volume sets forth the beginnings of opposing political opinions in colonial days, under a very limited suffrage and a partial representation. In those days scarcely a hundredth part of the people were allowed to vote. We are shown that the Declaration of Independence was a party platform and that the party of the Revolution had its left and its right wing under their respective leaders, like Samuel Adams and John Dickinson. There was, also, a conservative party, or body of opinion, opposed to change and ready to acquiesce in the British policy.

In the period of the Confederation nothing like national parties may be discerned, since the members of Congress represented the state legislatures and their election was entirely removed from the people. As the party of the Revolution (of 1776) was one outside the usual forms of law and procedure, so the party of the Constitution (of 1787) operated only through the state governments. Thus the author makes clear that up to 1789, though conflicting policies were subjects of sharp differences, there were no real parties in America in the modern sense.

As late as 1800, although there were divisive and positive differences between Hamilton and Jefferson, the modern party had not yet appeared; because, as Professor Robinson so clearly shows, there was very little

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organization among the voters and the people had very little to do with the issues. The *leader,* not the voter, was the basic element of parties. The party existed only in the English sense—as a group of leaders appealing to the legislative, or preparing programmes for the electorate to endorse. It was not until 1824–1832, in Jackson's time, that a party of leaders gave way to a party of voters.

Thus, in his thoughtful book, the author considers and analyzes the various movements and periods of American party history. Events are intelligently *related,* and, in consequence, their significance is clearly indicated. Party crises are analyzed, party changes accounted for. The volume is brief and sketchy, as of necessity, with the numberless topics brought under consideration. While it is descriptive, it is not the product of an effort at a sustained narrative but rather it is of the run-and-touch type of essay. However, the quick touch is nearly always suggestive and at times illuminating.

There is not much of new suggestion in the Jacksonian period; nor does the reviewer find a due appreciation of the underlying economic reasons for the appearance of the Greenback and Populist parties. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century and during much of the twentieth, the progress of American democracy and the changes in parties are to be studied largely outside of old party organization and action, and of this fact the volume under review seems hardly to take due account. Indeed, it may be said that here and there in party periods and crises the author hardly gives due weight to the influence of the nonconforming and protesting opinion that so often has had more to do with changing the course of party history than has the conventional action of both the old parties combined.

The author's account of the famous campaign of 1896 is good and generally fair, though he takes no note of Ben Tillman and his strong Southern following. Tillman represented a powerful party factor of the time and his "pitchfork" speech under Cleveland was a potent contribution to the unhorsing of the gold Democracy in the Democratic Convention of that year. The agrarian democracy of that time was Southern as well as Western.

In view of recent politics, the author might with profit have emphasized what he briefly indicates, how "radical" was the Republican party of Sumner and Wade, of Lincoln, Seward, and Thad. Stevens toward the Constitution and the courts, in the party's young days, when the Old Democracy of Buchanan and Jackson felt called upon to rally to the support of the courts as the shield of defense for property and the people. So much in politics depends upon whose ox is gored. So it has always been—from Jefferson to LaFollette, both of whom, and for the same reason, were denounced as "radicals", "revolutionaries", "anarchists", "opponents of government", and "destroyers of the Constitution". History teaches by analogy, and it seems that Professor Robinson's volume has neglected opportunities in this direction.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The volume is meagre for recent years. A reader first learning his party history from these pages would be left much in the dark as to why defeat came to the Republicans in 1916 and to the Democrats in 1920; nor would he be much informed on the third party and independent tendencies in the agrarian West during this period. Electoral results are mentioned, majorities by counties are appraised, but the events, forces, and causes leading thereto are not fully explained.

On the whole, a note of intelligent progressivism runs through the volume. It is written clearly and represents a large reserve of historical knowledge. Its pages will sustain the interest of the lay reader, and as for students and teachers of American politics, the reviewer feels bound to pronounce the book one of indispensable value.

The Spirit of the Revolution: New Light from some of the Original Sources of American History. By JOHN C. FITZPATRICK, A.M., Assistant Chief of the Manuscript Division, Library of Congress. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1924. Pp. xiii, 300. $4.00.)

To produce a valuable yet readable book dealing with relatively unimportant details of the American Revolution one must possess perception, imagination, and a certain amount of literary skill. Mr. Fitzpatrick is endowed with these three essentials and has blended them successfully in the series of papers which appeared in the *Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine* and now constitute this volume. Though most of the topics are of minor importance they can not fail to interest the historical student, the antiquarian, and even the general reader if he has in any degree a taste for American history. The student's attention will be arrested by the recently discovered contributions which Benjamin Franklin and John Adams made to the phraseology of the Declaration of Independence. The antiquarian will delight in the narrative that catalogues General Washington's many headquarters, in the homely paper entitled "Valley Forge Expenses", and likewise in those describing the music of the Continental Army and Lafayette's Liberty Loan of 1781. The general reader will probably find much that is new to him throughout the book, but his favorite essay is likely to be either "The Aides-de-Camp of General George Washington", or that which recounts the exploits of the daring sergeants who won the Purple Heart Badge of Military Merit.

Devoid of citations of authorities—an omission which the author explains in his preface—the chapters as a whole carry conviction because of Mr. Fitzpatrick's unadorned style and his careful statements. His imagination seems to be under control and he seems to refrain from positive statement except when the evidence is, to his mind, complete. This characteristic is especially noticeable in the paper which traces the history of the uniform of the Continental Army from brown through blue to blue and red. Where a less conscientious writer might have asserted

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that in the latter part of 1775 the American forces were clad in brown, Mr. Fitzpatrick adheres to the known fact "that the official uniform color first adopted for the Continental Army was brown".

Now and then, on the other hand, his undocumented statements are not entirely convincing. For instance, is it certain that the Continental Congress took the Declaration of Independence with it every time it moved from town to town? May not the archives have been a little less itinerant than the Congress that created them? And then there is the interesting account of the first use of U. S. A. as the initials of our country. Is it clear that the Congress, when it decided to have every cask of approved powder marked with these initials, intended that they should represent the United States of America and not the United States Army? Probably Mr. Fitzpatrick is right, but one becomes skeptical about him as an authority on initials when he suggests (p. 269) that L. S. at the end of the signature line of a minor legal document stands for "Legal Seal". The reviewer was brought up to believe that this is the abbreviation not for "Legal Seal" but for *locus sigilli* (the place of the seal), and is inclined to cling to his belief.

The treatise on Washington's aides-de-camp is admirable. Here one feels and shares the author's enthusiasm for the young men who at one time or another during the war belonged to the "family" of the commander-in-chief. Hamilton's brilliance and Tench Tilghman's devotion are especially well brought out. Even more strongly one feels and responds to Mr. Fitzpatrick's deep and intense admiration for Washington himself. More than one writer has attempted to humanize the Father of his Country, and more than one has failed. Mr. Fitzpatrick has succeeded. The Washington portrayed in this sketch is both human and sublime. The reflective reader, however, may not agree with the conclusion (p. 77) "that George Washington could have obtained hardly more than three consecutive hours of sleep in any twenty-four, during the eight years of the Revolutionary War". Does not the enormous amount of work which he performed in the course of a day indicate that he possessed extraordinary executive ability rather than that he worked at all hours of day and night?

The choosing of a title for his book—a title that will be both appropriate and engaging—is often a difficult problem for the serious writer. This, we surmise, was the case in the present instance. "Revolutionary Sketches" would have been too light; "Revolutionary Researches" too heavy. "Revolutionary Details" would have been inadequate. At first one is inclined to criticize Mr. Fitzpatrick for having chosen a title that is inappropriate. Yet, upon reflection, the lasting impression made by his book is the greatness of Washington. And the greatness of Washington, few will deny, is synonymous with "the spirit of the Revolution" at its best.

LAWRENCE SHAW MAYO.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The American States during and after the Revolution, 1775–1789. By ALLAN NEVINS. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1924. Pp. xviii, 728. $4.00.)

MR. NEVINS'S book is a remarkable compilation of facts on the history of the states from 1775 to 1789. Every teacher of history who has experienced the difficulty of getting up fresh lectures or class material on that subject must be grateful to the author. He has, in an incredibly short time, run through an enormous number of monographs, state histories, printed records, and articles in remote periodicals; he has frequently dipped into the newspapers, and occasionally into manuscript sources. His quotations and statements, so far as I have been able to check them, are accurate and reliable.

The chapter headings show the scope of the work: the Colonies before their Union; Transition from Colonies to States; Emergence of Popular Government; Writing of the State Constitutions; the Constitutions in Operation; Political Development in New England, the Middle States, the Upper South, the Lower South; Progress in Liberalism and Humanity; the States and their Money Affairs; State Quarrels and State Friendships; Relations of the States with Congress; Facing Westward.

Mr. Nevins has handled the thirteen strands rather deftly, now weaving them into one fabric, again separating them, individually or by bunches. Whatever confusion results from this method is cleared up by an excellent index. The treatment of different states is, however, rather uneven. A readable and coherent story is given of states like Virginia and North Carolina, where much archival and personal material has been published, where the issues are fairly clear cut, and the secondary histories are good. For Maryland, a state poor in published material and neglected by historians, the author has found it necessary to do research in the contemporary press, with excellent results. He is least effective with states such as Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, where the material is abundant but widely scattered in a mass of irrelevant antiquarian fuddy-duddery. There is much wanted a brief synthesis of the politics of these two states during the period 1775–1789; but Mr. Nevins has not supplied it. Underlying sectional, social, and racial antagonisms are obscured by details of "hot political contests". Instead of an independent examination into the workings of Pennsylvania's unique constitution we are given merely charges and counter-charges, and a detailed account of the struggle to get it supplanted. For Massachusetts, in overlooking the Essex Institute *Historical Collections* and the publications of the Colonial Society, the author has missed such important contributions as the Pickering-Williams correspondence and Professor Harlow's article on "Economic Conditions before Shays's Rebellion". On this last event, perhaps the most important local occurrence in the whole period, Mr. Nevins's treatment is quite inadequate—even more perfunctory than that of several general histories. There is too much detail on personal contests between

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adams, Hancock, and Bowdoin; too little on the fundamental conflict between town and country, seaboard and interior, and on its early symptoms, such as the price-fixing legislation, the tender act, and Ely's rebellion.

Mr. Nevins's method of presentation is not dynamic but static, like McMaster's, without the extensive use of contemporary material that makes McMaster's *History* so useful a mirror of the American mind. He seldom ventures upon an interpretation, or explains the lack of causal sequence in certain parts of his narrative. In Maryland, for instance, we find the same elements of discord as in Massachusetts and Virginia: tidewater against interior, conservative senate against radical house, and creditors against debtors. Luther Martin, like Gerry and Mason, refuses to sign the Federal Constitution, and appeals to the people with cogent arguments. We naturally expect a close and uncertain contest for ratification. Instead, the Federalists sweep the state, and the Constitution is ratified by a vote of 63 to 11. Why? And there are several subjects untouched by the book, upon which light is much more wanted than upon state politics. How did prices rise relative to wages during the war? Who was worse, and who better off at the close of it? Did the standard of living rise or fall? What was the mechanism of the early state governments, and their relation to the local units? What of that "hidden phase", the indispensable Irishman? What of emigration to northern New England, and the interior of New York and Pennsylvania? What religious developments took place, apart from disestablishment—why, for instance, did Virginia become free-thinking, and New England less tolerant? Social questions are not altogether neglected. There are some useful pages upon penal and humanitarian legislation, and on the paper-money agitation. But the treatment of education, literature, the Loyalists, and the westward movement leaves much to be desired.

Yet, after all is said, the fact remains that Mr. Nevins's book is a valuable one, crammed full of useful facts that were not readily accessible heretofore. Anyone studying the period will find it indispensable, if only as a starting-point. These ungracious criticisms are only offered (1) as a suggestion to students, that the social and economic history of the states during the Revolutionary period is still a fruitful subject for original research; (2) as a suggestion to the author, for the future series of which this volume "is meant to serve as the cornerstone". It is to be hoped that they may have more maturity and depth, without sacrificing the encyclopaedic breadth, the industry, and the accuracy which are the outstanding merits of the present work. S. E. Morison.

History of the Lost State of Franklin. By Samuel Cole Williams. (Johnson City, Tenn.: Watauga Press. 1924. Pp. xiii, 371. $4.50.)

If very soon "lost" to political geography, the state of Franklin assuredly has not been lost to history. For since John Haywood wrote, a

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

century ago, his *Civil and Political History of Tennessee,* the story of Franklin has been many times retold. But like Ramsey and Roosevelt and Alden, in their respective days, Judge Williams has increased our knowledge of this interesting expression of post-Revolutionary particularism through the utilization of new source-materials. The most important of these is found, of course, in the *North Carolina State Records,* which Judge Williams has combed with great diligence and with much profit. He has been fortunate, also, in the discovery of further newspaper material, particularly in the DeRenne Collection in Savannah. From the *Georgia State Gazette,* for example, he draws a long and enlightening contemporary account, hitherto unused, of a debate in a convention held in Franklin in May, 1787. He places the student under deep obligation to his legal learning and shows how profitable to the historian research in court decisions may be, by extracting many valuable data from Tennessee cases, neglected by earlier writers. He has found helpful sidelights in the accounts of travellers. He has used to advantage, though not perhaps to the fullest profit or with so firm a handling as elsewhere, the important "Papers relating to Bourbon County" which E. C. Burnett contributed to volume XV. of the *Review.*

Utilizing such new materials, and carefully re-examining the old, Judge Williams has given us what is by far the best account of the state of Franklin. His work is strongest where it deals with the actions of the leaders and the people of Franklin, in their constitution- and law-making, their politics, their Indian fighting, their modes of life. Besides, he emphasizes the importance of the North Carolina cession of 1784 and of the repeal of that cession the same year and the significance, in this connection, of the relations of North Carolina with the Congress of the United States. He gives due attention to the legislation of North Carolina with regard to land and to the influence of the spirit of speculation in the western lands. He does not, in the opinion of the reviewer, reach all the economic phases of this matter which should be studied—for example, the system of taxation developed in North Carolina or the management of the Indian trade. Particularly valuable is his discussion of the hunger of the speculators, including John Sevier, for the rich lands situated in the "Bend" of the Tennessee River, then in dispute between Georgia and South Carolina, and now part of northern Alabama. Judge Williams makes very clear the close relations that existed between Georgia and Franklin, in which connection it may be suggested, however, that a search of the manuscript journals of the legislature of Georgia would doubtless yield yet more light. Less satisfactory is the author's account of Spanish relations and of Spanish influence in Indian affairs. His narrative of Sevier's correspondence with the Spanish authorities has too much of an apologetic tone. One does not find either in the bibliography or in the foot-notes reference to the work of Gayarré, among the older writers, or to the writings of Miss Berry or Serrano y Sanz among later students.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In general Judge Williams writes with fairness and without bias. He candidly admits the "editing" of the spelling of documents, but he exhibits care as to the accuracy and completeness of his texts. He corrects many errors in the works of the earlier writers: occasionally such a phrase as "Roosevelt, in error" reveals the former judge. The value of the book is enhanced by the addition of a number of sketches of the leading supporters and opponents, respectively, of the Franklin movement, among the people of the region involved. The inclusion of a couple of maps would have greatly helped the student. Except for the use of a rather small type, and a very few misprints, the format of the book is good. On page 3, it may be noted, a sentence has been broken into two imperfect parts. There is an adequate index and a bibliography, which omits the dates of publication. The sole illustration, the frontispiece, is a portrait of Sevier.

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT.

Frances Wright. By WILLIAM RANDALL WATERMAN, Ph.D., Instructor in History in Dartmouth College. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. CXV., no. 1.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1924. Pp. 267. $3.50.)

MUCH of the American public of Jacksonian times, which admired the strong-minded Harriet Martineau and hated the sharp-tongued Mrs. Trollope, regarded Frances Wright as a reckless if not incendiary disturber of public order and morals. Her bold and energetic personality presented an arresting subject for a biographer. Moreover, she touched American social life and jarred American thought at so many points that a study of her career was certain to turn up valuable historical material for the years 1818–1838. Mr. Waterman has been fortunate to find an abundance of new material. Miss Wright's voluminous papers are still largely intact in the hands of her grandson, the Rev. William Norman Guthrie of New York, and the author has supplemented them by a study of the contemporary press and other sources. His monograph is interesting as a study of a picturesque, vigorous character, and worth attention for the light it throws upon the early history of the woman's movement, the labor movement, of free thought, of the slavery question, and of communistic societies in the United States. Miss Wright was concerned with them all, though Mr. Waterman correctly says that the chief contribution of this follower of Mary Wollstonecraft was to the intellectual emancipation of women.

Frances Wright, an English girl of good family and some means, first attracted attention as the author of a book of travel-letters upon the United States, published in 1821 in London and New York, and soon accorded the distinction of French and Dutch translations. She was proud

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this book, and attributed to it a wholly exaggerated influence, which Mr. Waterman indiscreetly accepts. As the Duke of Saxe-Weimar was told by American friends, and as the *Quarterly Review* assured its readers, her work was an uncritical panegyric of people and government, written by an observer so careful not to injure her prepossessions that she long refused to enter the slave states. She never had the calm, impartial temper needed by a critic. Carefully educated in London, she early became a friend of Bentham, James Mill, Francis Place, and other thinkers, and of Lafayette in France, who might have made her his adopted daughter but for family opposition. Nurtured on Epicurean philosophy, English radicalism, and French rationalism, Miss Wright became a born reformer, and concluded that even America was not so perfect but that she could do much to improve it.

The best chapters in Mr. Waterman's volume detail her most ambitious scheme and most utter failure, the famous community she founded at Nashoba, Tennessee, in 1826. Her original plan, blessed by Jefferson, was to colonize it with slaves and train them for emancipation, using their earnings to pay their purchase price. After being given freedom, they were to be established independently and more slaves absorbed by the growing community. The scheme was impractical, but deserved a fairer trial than it received. Infected by Robert Owen's ideas, and cursed with visionary associates, Miss Wright was persuaded within a few months to give up the experiment in self-emancipation, and remodel Nashoba as a co-operative community of the type of New Harmony, with negroes doing the heavier work. The incompetency of the trustees to manage the negroes, and the indiscreet publicity they gave their ideas of free love and race amalgamation, ruined the badly located venture at once. Miss Wright, having lost $16,000 in the venture, turned to the lecture platform, and by her attacks upon the restriction of women's sphere, education, and civil rights, and upon what she deemed the intolerant phases of organized religion, made a sensation. Her appeals in behalf of rationalism and personal freedom, delivered with eloquence and magnetism, converted a number of hearers and outraged the sensibilities of more. Mr. Waterman covers this fully, as he does her espousal of the newborn labor movement of the late 'twenties. But after two years of lecturing and writing, leaving a storm in her wake wherever she went, she sailed to Europe to marry.

Mr. Waterman assembles his facts with accuracy and general thoroughness and presents them in interesting style. His narrative flags towards the end, largely because of exhaustion of materials. Thus he has little to say of Miss Wright's last visit to America, beginning in 1836, and does not even give the year of her final departure. Nor is he able to offer any data indicating the exact scope of her influence. The writings of William Leggett, unmentioned in his bibliography, contain a good many references to "Fanny Wrightism" and the current views taken of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it. But whatever the extent of her influence, she was a woman who deserved this excellent biographical study.

The First One Hundred Years of American Geology. By GEORGE P. MERRILL, Head Curator of Geology, United States National Museum. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1924. Pp. xxi, 773. $6.00.)

A HUNDRED AND FIFTY years ago, geology found a peculiarly favorable environment in North America. The continent spread before the early observers an exceptionally varied and instructive exhibit of nearly all the phenomena whose study and interpretation have since led to the great body of soundly established principles which make up the science to-day. In the United States and Canada the same language was spoken; the ties of kindred and inheritance were close; and the geologic studies in the two countries were carried on in close association. North America, moreover, is richly endowed with ores of almost every kind and with other useful minerals on whose utilization the advance of the arts and manufactures depended, and for whose development the applications of geology were all-important. Dr. Merrill, therefore, in the above work discusses one of the most important and one of the most truly indigenous of our early lines of intellectual development. His book has claims to the interest, not alone of geologists, but of students of American history, who, following the lines so ably expounded for years by James Harvey Robinson, are attracted by the intellectual life of the people at large, rather than by the wars and rulers.

Dr. Merrill prepared for his latest work by a course of training which gave him a very detailed command of the subject. His earlier books, *Contributions to the History of American Geology* (1906) and *Contributions to the History of the American State Geological and Natural History Surveys* (1920), lead logically and directly to the grand summary volume before us. In the present work, using men rather than surveys and learned societies as the foundation, he has traced the first appearance of crude ideas, as set forth in the imaginative hypotheses characteristic of extreme youth; the later development, of sounder and sounder conclusions, as the exuberance of immaturity wore off; and finally the establishment of sober and well-grounded views, characteristic of vigorous middle life. The absurd views and contributions now come from the opponents of geology of the school of W. J. Bryan and George Macready Price and are based partly on incurable prejudice and partly on equally incurable ignorance.

With all the patience and care of the historical investigator, and with the conscientious accuracy of the man of science, Dr. Merrill has sought, collected, and read not only published books and papers, but personal correspondence and contemporary records. In addition, he has secured, when possible, the personal recollections of still surviving participants in

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the more recent events which he describes. He thus has come into possession of an impressive amount of material, which he has grouped in chronological and also logical sequence. He habitually summarizes the subject-matter of one or several contributions and follows up the summary with a brief sketch of the life and characteristics of the author, and with a portrait. By this systematic treatment, a detailed history of the science has been built up, which leaves upon the reader the irrepressible feeling that a great drama is being played before his eyes, in which, at times, the action attains heroic proportions. The struggles of early workers against difficulties and restrictions, the consuming devotion to their chosen calling, which carried them through privation and hardships, and the profoundly impressive conceptions of time, of earth forces, of earth history, and of life development which they gradually evolved, all stamp upon the mind of a reader an impression which is enhanced, if anything, by the human touch afforded by the generosities or jealousies, the greatness or the littleness, of the individuals involved.

Dr. Merrill divides his selected century, 1785–1885, into four eras, of which the Maclurean era, 1785–1819, is the first. The name of William Maclure, "the father of American Geology", is selected for it. As an introduction to this chapter, the author briefly reviews such development of geological science as existed in Europe, on which, to an important extent, the early workers in America necessarily drew. The introduction, though brief, is an excellent one along the lines usually followed by writers on the history of geology, but the attention is focused customarily on the large generalizations of the infant science and such questions as the origin and formation of the ancient and later rocks, about which much that was imaginative was written. There was, nevertheless, a sound mass of observation, patiently gathered by the mining fraternity, which deals with structural geology and which is set forth even in the works of Agricola in the sixteenth century. When one reads Agricola's *De Re Metallica* (1556), now accessible in English through the scholarly translation by Herbert C. Hoover and Mrs. Hoover, one soon realizes that stratified rocks, folds, faults, mineral veins, and much more were quite correctly grasped. Back of the flights of the Neptunists and the Plutonists was a not always appreciated stock of sound geological knowledge. Once embarked, however, on the review of the early American work, few, if any, contemporary records of importance are overlooked by Dr. Merrill.

The second era—from 1820 to 1829—is named, after Amos Eaton, the Eatonian. It is marked by more careful geological mapping and by the endeavors of the early workers to record and describe the facts, and then to reason on the basis of the accumulated evidence. The third era is that of the state surveys, and is subdivided into five decades, beginning with 1830 and closing with 1879. While the text follows, in the main, the official reports, yet contributions from individuals are also carefully re-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

viewed. As indicated above, the excellent plan is systematically followed of summarizing an author's work and then giving a sketch of his life. For all the geologists of eminence this has been done except for J. D. Whitney, who, aside from a short paragraph on page 411, was overlooked among so many. Whitney was practically the first of American-born geologists to bring a preparation in both an American college and European universities to bear on his investigations in his native country. The benefits are shown in his accuracy and precision.

The fourth era is that of the national surveys, and necessarily overlaps the later years of the state surveys. Expeditions under the federal government were indeed sent to the West all through the earlier part of the nineteenth century, but were so scattered and disconnected as to justify placing the beginnings of national surveys in the years following the Civil War. The time limit, of 1885, makes it possible only to summarize briefly the first six years of the present United States Geological Survey.

Following the review of these personal and official activities, Dr. Merrill states in condensed form the development of seven great problems, or subjects, and the solutions reached, giving a chapter to each; viz., the Fossil Foot-prints of the Connecticut Valley; the Eozoon Question; the Laramie Question; the Taconic Question; the Development of the Glacial Hypothesis; the Development of Micro-petrology; and, referring to the earth, the question, How Old is It? All these subjects were of prime importance in their day, and the special condensed statements will be of great value to students.

On a page headed "Finale", the five great contributions of America to geology, as judged by the author, are briefly stated as follows:

> First, the fundamental problem of continental uplift and depression, as made by Dana; second, in those relating to the physics and structure of mountain ranges, made by the Rogers brothers, LeConte, and Dana; third, in those relating to glaciers and glaciation, by Agassiz and the elder Hitchcock, and later by Chamberlin; fourth, in those relating to isostasy and physiography, made by Dutton, Gilbert, and Powell in the arid regions; and fifth, in those relating to vertebrate evolution, made by Leidy, Cope, and Marsh.

One can not help feeling that the classification of the palaeozoic section and its palaeontology, as worked out especially by James Hall in the incomparable series of slightly disturbed and richly fossiliferous strata of New York, furnishing, as it did, a standard of world-wide application, runs on all fours with any of the five selected, and that no summary is complete without its inclusion. When we turn to the seventy-two pages of personal letters in the appendix, those from James Hall are more conspicuous and fundamental than the letters of any other of the geologists selected.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A few typographical slips have escaped notice in editing. Josiah Dwight Whitney appears as J. A. Whitney, on page 204, and as James Dwight Whitney, in the group opposite page 408. The paragraph beginning, "Alger was an iron and steel manufacturer," on page 121, has no apparent connection with anything near it. A reader wonders if something has been omitted which showed the connection. On page 162, Isle la Motte, in Lake Champlain, has slipped in for Mine la Motte, Missouri. On page 539, the famous case of salting supposed mining claims with diamonds, which was detected by Clarence King, was staged in western Wyoming, where the survey of the Fortieth Parallel had indeed studied the geology, rather than in Arizona, where it had not worked.

But amid the many and great excellences of this monumental work, it seems invidious and unjustifiable to point out small slips. Every young man, preparing for a geologist's career, should read it from cover to cover, and should thereby acquire an acquaintance with the heroes of his science; should imbue himself with its traditions; and be prepared thereby to endure its hardships in his ambition to add to its priceless stores of scientific truth.

JAMES F. KEMP.

Recent American History. By LESTER BURRELL SHIPPEE, Associate Professor of History in the University of Minnesota. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1924. Pp. vii, 554. $3.25.)

PROFESSOR SHIPPEE'S book covers the period between 1865 and March 4, 1923. The wrapper conveys the information that the book is "written from the new viewpoint which emphasizes the interrelation between economic and political factors", and this is a fair enough statement. About one-fifth of the volume is devoted to economic development and in the remaining chapters the influence of the economic on the political is strongly emphasized. Of course in the case of the period 1877–1896 the application is more or less familiar, showing the influence of economic unrest on currency and tariff legislation, on the attempt to regulate corporations and railroads, and on third-party movements. The development of labor organization is handled with detail somewhat unusual in a book of this scope. Professor Shippee is perhaps on ground a little less familiar to the average student of American history when he traces the movement of the United States in the world's politics successively in the Caribbean, in South America, in the world at large, to the spread of her investments beyond her own borders. For the last Cuban insurrection and the Spanish-American War, for instance, he finds an origin in the investment of American interests in Cuban sugar plantations. In view of all the emphasis on the economic, one regrets that a little more attention was not given to the social side of history. A contrast of the ways of life of an average American family or community in 1865, in 1896, and in 1923 would have been illuminating.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In his treatment of the period of American history since 1912, it is not difficult to see in Mr. Shippee an admirer of Woodrow Wilson. In peace and in war the censure visited upon Wilson is rare and mild. The pages on the ill-fated treaty of Versailles, while written with scrupulous and restrained fairness, reveal a marked sympathy with the President. In the years since 1920 Professor Shippee has to confine himself to a bald narrative of happenings, with a minimum of comment and interpretation. The style of the book is serious, in places as a result of long paragraphs even a little heavy. One suspects that occasionally there are a few too many facts and names to be carried easily by the narrative. But to the American undergraduate for whose class-room use the book is manifestly prepared the above characteristics are excellences.

The weak point in the book is the chapter on the Forces at the Front, which demands rewriting in any future edition. Professor Shippee fails to distinguish among military events the essential from the casual. No one would recognize in the sentence or two on page 455 the real history of the brilliant offensive of the First and Second divisions on July 18 that drove in the west front of the Chateau-Thierry salient. In the page and a half allotted to the St. Mihiel offensive there is nothing to show the essential character of the operation, the pinching out of the salient by attacks from both angles of its base. The two and a half pages on the Meuse-Argonne offensive, pages 459–461, literally bristle with errors. The 77th Division was nowhere near Montfaucon. Montfaucon was taken on the 27th of September and not by noon of the 26th. The 33d Division had reached its objective on the Meuse about 10 o'clock on the morning of the 26th. Why mention the comparatively insignificant combats of the 28th in the neighborhood of Brieulles and omit all mention of the German counter-attack on the centre of the American line, or the magnificent later work of the First Division at Exermont in retrieving the failure of the 35th? The fighting of October 4 did not drive the Germans almost out of the Argonne. The shortage of replacements would not be a reason for failure to relieve units in the line promptly. On page 464 what does Professor Shippee mean by "the First Battalion, the 339th Infantry, the 310th Engineers, a Field Hospital company and an Ambulance company"? However, Professor Shippee, after losing the "Lost Battalion", makes no attempt to find it again; and his chapter has that one virtue at least. His errors lap over into the chapter on the peace treaty. German envoys were not received at Versailles on the 7th of November to listen to the terms of an armistice.

Generally speaking, the book is marred by errors of proof-reading that seem to lie between author and publisher: "James Gilespie Blaine", page 31; "Colin P. Huntington", page 118; "discrete" (prudent), page 121; "indiscrete", page 179; "Burke Cockran", page 190; both "Habana", and "Havana", on page 241; "Bogatá", page 306; "Buneau-Varilla" (*bis*), page 306; "William M. McKinley", page 370; "William

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

F. McCoombs", page 373; "Brant Whitlock", page 406; "Chateau-Saline", page 462; "Cavite", presumably should be "El Caney", on page 246.

T. C. PEASE.

Men and Policies: Addresses by ELIHU ROOT. Collected and edited by ROBERT BACON and JAMES BROWN SCOTT. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1924. Pp. x, 509. $5.00.)

THIS, the latest volume in a series of the collected writings and addresses of Elihu Root, is divided into three sections: I. Some Americans (pp. 3–117); II. Law and its Administration (pp. 121–165); III. The War and Readjustment (pp. 169–499). A large portion of the materials has been garnered from Mr. Root's work during the years 1918–1923. Three selections, however, come from earlier times: Instructions to the American Delegates to the Second Hague Conference (May 31, 1907); letter of instructions (July 20, 1913) to Robert Bacon, who was sent to South America that year by the Carnegie Endowment; and an address in memory of Joseph H. Choate delivered before the New York City Bar Association on December 20, 1917. Varied and occasional as most of these papers are, they reveal the broad scope of Mr. Root's interests. Moreover they characterize admirably much of the better thought and the sane, if conservative, tendencies of these times. Indeed they amount to a series of impressive commentaries on a few of our leading men—such, for examples, as Roosevelt, Choate, Lincoln, Cleveland, and Hamilton—on law, on public opinion as observed in a democracy, on government, and in particular on the foreign relations of the United States.

Mr. Root's tributes to Roosevelt, to Joseph H. Choate, and to Lincoln are full of wisdom, understanding, and fine feeling. His eulogy of Hamilton is sure to impress some readers as excessive here and there in its language. No single topic is more clearly and adequately elucidated in the volume than that which concerns the Permanent Court of International Justice, the institution which since February, 1922, has been functioning at the Hague. This court, in Mr. Root's judgment, marks the maturing of tendencies of thought coupled with a series of circumstances which, reckoned from at least as far back as 1899, the year of the assembling of the first Hague Conference, have brought it into being. In its particular relations to the present League of Nations he finds no sound reasons why the United States should not sanction and become a member of the court. What he observes is this:

> that the protocol or treaty constituting this court makes it a world court and not a League court; and especially it should be noted (1) that all states, including the United States, are made competent suitors before the court; (2) that the citizens of all states, including the United States, are made eligible for election to be judges of the court, as the election and membership of a distinguished American indicates; (3) that all states

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which were members of the old Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague, including the United States, are entitled to make nominations which shall form a part of the eligible list from which judges are to be elected. . . . (4) that in electing a judge, the members of the Assembly and of the Council of the League of Nations are not exercising any power vested in them by the League or by the Covenant. . . . (5) that the protocol contains an express invitation to states not members of the League, including the United States, to become parties to the treaty by adherence (pp. 416–417).

Of miscellaneous papers or speeches the following will be found to be peculiarly informative and thoughtful: "The Standard of Legal Education" (pp. 141–157); "The Restoration Policies of the United States" (pp. 210–231); "International Law after the War" (pp. 424–442); and "A Requisite for the Success of Popular Diplomacy" (pp. 476–485; first published on September 15, 1922, in *Foreign Affairs*, I. 3–10). The student of the much-debated Versailles Treaty of 1919 will find in this volume Mr. Root's two well-known letters addressed, the first to Will H. Hays, chairman of the Republican National Committee, under date of March 29, 1919, and the second to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, under date of June 21, 1919. Added to these is a speech bearing on the same subject delivered in New York City on October 19, 1920 (see pp. 248–291).

The volume, like its predecessors, is beautifully printed, well bound, and accompanied by an adequate index.

H. B. L.

Wisconsin Domesday Book. Edited by JOSEPH SCHAFER. [Publications of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Town Studies, vol. I.] (Madison: the Society. 1924. Pp. 168. $5.00.)

THE aim of the *Wisconsin Domesday Book* is to give the pioneer history and development of all the townships of the state. Its chief service is to present a class of data which so far has not been made available by any historical society. At the beginning of each of the twenty-three town studies in this initial volume is furnished a map, on which are inscribed the names of the owners of farm land in 1860 and the date when the owner of each unit, from forty acres up, bought the land from a private party or from the government. Thus a glimpse is given of the pioneer owner of every farm in the township. Certain farm statistics, such as the amount of cultivated acres, farm value, value of live stock and machinery, and bushels of wheat produced, are printed on the map unit for each farm. The original surveyor's notes, giving topography, timber, and quality of the soil, are found on the margin. These maps furnish material for the history of the settlement of Wisconsin. Some of this material has already been used in the *History of Agriculture* (*Wisconsin Domesday Book, General Studies*, vol. I.). Light is thrown on the choice of land by the New Englanders and Germans and the influence of specu-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lation upon settlement. The German farmers and poor Americans preferred the forest area of eastern Wisconsin close to market, while the well-to-do Yankees chose the open country. Land which was surveyed in the full tide of settlement passed into the hands of the actual settlers, but land surveyed ahead of settlement was bought largely by speculators. In the towns of this volume native settlers were less inclined to pay the higher price which the speculators demanded than were foreigners. They would rather go farther away and buy government land. Material from later volumes of town studies is needed to establish this generalization.

The history of each of the twenty-three towns follows its respective map. The common topics are location and drainage, types of soil, timber, beginnings of settlement, progress of farm-making, classification of farms according to area, general and special productions, manufactures, schools and churches, and population changes. Here is set down in clear and careful exposition a skeleton of scientifically determined facts, based on United States, Wisconsin, and county records, Wisconsin periodicals, newspapers, and county histories. Pioneer reminiscences or descriptions of social history are given for nine of the towns. These town histories vary in human interest, depending upon the volume of secondary and source-material. The history of New Glarus gives a clear picture of the change from the production of wheat to dairying. Wheat production increased up to 1869 and then declined. By 1880 New Glarus had more milch cows than any of the other towns and far exceeded the others in gallons of milk and cheese. Its Swiss settlers brought with them an inherited tendency toward dairying and easily changed to cheese-making when the wheat crop failed in the early 1870's. By 1885 New Glarus was making 949,288 pounds of cheese and selling it to Milwaukee, Chicago, St. Louis, England, and Switzerland. The production of cheese mounted to 1,395,712 pounds in 1905.

The volume contains an introduction giving some generalizations from the town studies, including a comparison of valuations and productions in 1880, 1905, and 1920, and the characteristics of the towns according to certain groupings. An appendix is added, furnishing census tables of agricultural statistics. A detailed index adds to the value of the book.

RAYNOR G. WELLINGTON.

A History of Minnesota. By WILLIAM WATTS FOLWELL. In four volumes. Volume II. (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society. 1924. Pp. xv, 477. $5.00.)

THE second of the four volumes of this *History of Minnesota* covers the history of the first seven years of the new, thinly populated state, 1858–1865. It might have as a subtitle *The Young Minnesota Facing West and South,* and fumbling badly in all the work she had to do, whether admission to the Union, the organization of the state government, financing of wild schemes for railroads, Indian warfare, or a share in the Civil War.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Six of its twelve chapters, or more than one-half of the body of the text and practically all of nearly one hundred pages devoted to elaborate appendixes, deal with the Sioux outbreak of 1862 and its antecedents and consequences. For Minnesota's part in the Civil War and the politics connected with it three chapters suffice. A single chapter shows the zig-zag and thorny political path, through slavery and Kansas questions, which the territory had to take on its way to statehood; another chapter throws interesting light on the half-baked and sometimes dishonest schemes for state grants of lands, subsidies, and loans of credit to railroad companies. A final chapter on Gleanings completes the volume, which as a whole is disappointing in its proportions and emphasis.

The story of the Sioux massacres naturally occupies a leading place in the history of the five years here discussed, and the admirable and vigorous presentation of the causes and sequel of the Indian outbreak will be prized as a fresh treatment of a phase of the "transit of civilization" across the continent, in which Minnesota had experiences common to a dozen other commonwealths between the Canadian and Mexican borders. Chapters VIII. and IX. illustrate the author's power of penetration and condensed interpretation of events as he discusses the Indian point of view in the losing struggle against the aggressive and rough-handed frontiersmen, the lax and corrupt federal Indian agents, and the greed of speculators and traders. But interesting, important, and inevitable as the Sioux outbreak was, and necessary as it is to understand that the whites considered the driving out of the Indians by fair means or foul as a part of the process of "clearing the land", there is quite insufficient justification for allotting one-eighth of the total space of a history of so significant a state as Minnesota to a single episode, or for including in both text and foot-notes the minutiae of names, dates, times of day, movements of Indian bands and fleeing settlers, and pro-and-con gossip and hearsay, as in chapters V., VI., VII., and X. Granting that this Indian war, which was carried on in the midst of the Civil War, and which temporarily almost emptied of their white population twenty-three counties in a region two hundred miles long and fifty miles wide, was "one of the bloodiest of Indian outbreaks on the Continent" (p. 212), the repetition of wearisome and ghastly details does not add strength to the narrative.

The exactness, fullness, and discrimination of the references in the foot-notes, particularly those for the chapters on railroad legislation (ch. II.), on state politics on the eve of the Rebellion (ch. III.), and on the Indian wars (chs. V.–X.), reflect much credit on the author and on the editorial staff of the Minnesota Historical Society. Eleven full-page reproductions of contemporary pictures, documents, and cartoons, together with twenty-four maps, are notably pertinent and informing; for example, the Sioux delegation of 1858, Fort Snelling in war-time, a pioneer railroad train, and a map showing the location and number of the victims of the Sioux massacre.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here, as in the first volume, are piquant paragraphs and illuminating sketches relating to outstanding pioneer figures which cast long shadows across the history of the state: H. H. Sibley and Alexander Ramsay, mentioned in a review of the first volume, Senator James Shields, who once challenged Abraham Lincoln to a duel (p. 7), the pugnacious and versatile Ignatius Donnelly (p. 60), Henry B. Whipple, apostle to the Indians and the first Protestant Episcopal bishop of Minnesota (p. 206), and C. E. Flandreau, Indian agent, lawyer, colonel, and justice of the supreme court of the state.

KENDRIC C. BABCOCK.

Canadian Federation, its Origins and Achievement: a Study in Nation Building. By REGINALD GEORGE TROTTER, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in Stanford University. (Toronto and London: J. M. Dent and Sons. 1924. Pp. xiv, 348. $1.75.)

PROFESSOR TROTTER, in his study of Canadian federation, has aimed to survey the political and economic forces, separately and in combination, which led to the creation of the Dominion of Canada. He has made himself a thorough master of the manuscript and printed sources and has arranged his monograph in three divisions—the realization of the political dream, the accomplishment of economic unity, the general conclusions. His success is not so much in his contribution to historical knowledge—the new material, large though it is, merely fills in details—as in his skilled fitting of the whole thing into a synthetic story of a great and significant achievement.

The first division is on the whole weak, compressed, and cursory. Indeed the subject is threadbare, but Professor Trotter missed an opportunity to which he might well return. No one has done at all adequately for Canada what Professor Farrand in his *Framing of the Constitution* has done for the United States. We need a comparative view of what the Canadian "fathers" brought to their work—their political past, their personalities, their political principles. We need a study of how a territorial fringe cuts across creative politics at such moments in history as the creation of the United States, Canada, and Australia. No one has adequately taken this fact into consideration in studying what is called the "historic spirit" of the respective constitutions.

In the second division of his subject Professor Trotter has performed a service for which all students will be distinctly grateful. The mass of material is analyzed with the greatest care and the problem of transportation takes for the first time its due and essential place in this period of Canadian history. It is at length possible to realize the interaction of domestic and international politics and railroading among the forces working for the creation of the Dominion, and nowhere else can the student obtain such an adequate and complete account of the political influence of the railroaders and railway promoters. We congratulate Pro-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fessor Trotter on a piece of work successfully accomplished. Now that he has joined the staff of Queen's University, Kingston, we shall look for further work in Canadian history. His keen interest in the West might, we hope, lead him to prepare a monograph on its judicial, legislative, and executive scheme before the completion of the provincial organization. In this hope we venture to suggest two things. First, notes ought to be at the foot of each page. To place them at the ends of the chapters is distressfully irritating. Second, the style is heavy and difficult. Mr. Trotter is too well trained not to know that bricks and mortar do not make a house, and that Lord Haldane's Creighton Lecture remains for all of us an incentive and a guide.

There are some points which need attention. We can not understand the map of British North America which serves as a frontispiece. It is undated and is (we believe) unused in the text. Internal evidence seems to point to a period before 1840. We may be quite wrong, but we have failed to satisfy ourselves as to its suitability or purpose. The statement as to the principle governing the disallowance of provincial acts is inadequate and incorrect (p. 110). The problem of *ultra vires* is resolved by the judiciary, not by the federal executive. Nor has the exercise of the power "almost disappeared". Unfortunately both the present federal government and its predecessor have exercised it and made themselves the guardians of "equity and good legislation" to the confusion of constitutional theory and right. A record of the debates in 1864 on the distribution of members in the Senate survives, if not in Pope, in A. A. Macdonald's notes on the Quebec Conference; and the suggestion that senators should be appointed by the provincial legislatures *was* discussed on the motion of Prince Edward Island (p. 117, notes 21, 23). A *full* report from the Economic Commissioners of 1865 is in the Canada Sessional Papers (p. 138, note 13). Notice might be taken of the North-West Transportation, Navigation, and Railway Company of 1858 (27 Victoria, c. 122), and of Allen MacDonnell's pamphlet giving an account of it (Toronto, 1858). The names of Carmichael Smyth's and M. H. Synge's works (pp. 257, 258) ought to be given, especially as they do not appear in the bibliography. If they are worthy of mention much more so is the completely worked-out scheme of an Atlantic-Pacific Railway found in Wilson and Richards, *Britain Redeemed and Canada Preserved* (London, 1850), which appears to be entirely overlooked. The date "1874" (p. 328) is a slip.

The book is a distinct and valuable addition to the political and economic history of North America, and Professor Trotter has every reason to be proud of his first work. The bibliography and index are excellent.

W. P. M. Kennedy.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Maximilian und Charlotte von Mexiko. Nach dem bisher unveröffentlichten Geheimarchive des Kaisers Maximilian und sonstigen unbekannten Quellen, von EGON CAESAR Conte CORTI. In zwei Bänden. (Zurich, Vienna, and Leipzig: Amalthea-Verlag. 1924. Pp. 330, 36; 436, 87.)

THE author spent nearly three years investigating in the so-called secret archives of Maximilian at Vienna, the documents in which had hitherto been inaccessible. His aim was to use the new material so as to round out a restatement of the oft-repeated tale of tragedy that had its closing scene in the execution at Querétaro. In most cases those who have essayed to tell the story have been, as Corti remarks, either Francophobes, clericals, liberal revolutionists, or Austrians, each with a partizan point of view in presenting the subject. His own effort was to tell the dramatic episode with rigid adherence to the truth. In pursuit of this ideal he read the correspondence of the chief actors, often with the photograph of the writer of each letter close at hand in order to facilitate close interpretation. From several descendants of those who were minor characters in the tragedy he obtained still other unused materials, so that he had unusual opportunity to present new light on the erratic and selfish project promoted, fostered, then deserted by Napoleon III.

In spite of this intimate treatment *in extenso,* and of the inclusion of almost every point brought out by earlier writers, there is little new in the presentation. The documents appended, and those quoted in full in the text, present conclusive proof of what was well known before from the course of events and the other available records. There is an inherent value in having the authoritative documents cited and printed, and in having the facsimiles and reproductions of many historical paintings of the departure of the ill-starred and self-deceived sovereigns from Austria; but what most strikes the American reader first is the fact that the episode is treated as one of European rather than American history. In this treatment, while there is adequate portrayal of the court life, ambition, and intrigue of the 'sixties, with intimate pictures of the personal character of each of the leading actors, there are two regrettable attitudes of preconception. The first is that the Mexican anarchy prior to and under Juárez was without vestige of principle, without any clear aim on the part of the liberals save a factious spirit of misrule. Though it is made evident that the clericals were hopelessly reactionary in their conception of the state and the position of the Church in it, nowhere are Juárez and his associates credited with the integrity of purpose which was evident in their dogged tenacity and patent in spite of their severity. There is no appreciation of the fact that the Mexican nation suffered far more and received more cruel injustice from the French intervention than could any European associated with it, even Maximilian. Corti makes evident that a leading factor in the archduke's decision to undertake the redemption of Mexico was profound ignorance of its actual condition, but

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he shows no recognition of the truth that the intervention was the heinous and ghastly offense it was because it thwarted the will of a people to attain in actuality that modern independence of clerical and military oppression out of which it had been duped by its first tawdry emperor, the Liberator Iturbide.

The second effect of writing this episode as a phase of European history is a similar failure to appreciate the attitude of the United States toward Maximilian and Napoleon. Such an American spirit as is indicated might have been excused in view of the insistence of both those men on recognition of the Confederacy by European powers, and it is possible that the life of Maximilian might have been spared but for the inexplicable indifference or cowardice of Seward's envoy to Juárez, Campbell; but the book would have shown better balance had it emphasized the influence on world history which was presaged in case Napoleon's dream of control of Mexico and the Gulf had actually erected the check he desired upon the growth of the United States.

There is a fair, though incomplete, working bibliography; a register of names takes the place of an index. The narrative is, after all the comments here offered, the most complete and unbiassed one yet presented. There is a map, interesting if not important, showing Maximilian's dream of spread of the Hapsburg power to Brazil through his brother Ludwig Victor; the younger man was wise enough to forego the lure which undid his idealistic relative.

HERBERT I. PRIESTLEY.

MINOR NOTICES

The Lessons of History. By C. S. Leavenworth, M.A. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1924, pp. iii, 100, $1.50.) In a pleasantly written essay of one hundred pages the author urges the study of history for the purpose of gaining from the experience of the past practical rules of conduct for individuals and nations. In this he is not an innovator, for the pulpit for a thousand years has been engaged in this occupation. The ancient prophets spoke in the name of the Lord, and their successors attempted to halt the world on its inevitable rush to perdition, or tried to make it go faster toward the light, according as they believed the golden age to have passed away or to be a bright hope for the future. All to the effect that men and nations suffer for their sins, upon which general theme there can be no dissent.

But Mr. Leavenworth is aiming at a set of formulae under which the lessons of history can be learned. He denies very properly that there are in history any laws of inevitable recurrence as in the natural world. He assumes that this pragmatic presentation of the past is an art, rather than a science, but at the same time he repeatedly uses the word "law" to reinforce his theory. He calls up cases to show that the substance of history is the instinctive struggle of mankind to improve in "culture,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comfort, and order". One might argue that the desire for the first came after all the others, but we are asked to assume that the great law of history is that the longing of mankind is for civilization. Advancement in this has alternated with relapse, and from examples which he draws from six thousand years there emerges a formula something like this: A nation favored with vigorous mentality and genial environment builds up a strong state, wealth is acquired, luxury and weakness ensue, invasion by outsiders brings on a relapse into barbarism, or, at the point of weakness the strong man enters, freedom is destroyed, and the cause of liberty must start all over again. Citing many instances which to him confirm the "law" of invasion and dictatorship, the author concludes that for the present the danger to society impends not so much from possible dictators, but rather from socialism, which represents the nomad tribe seeking a short cut to riches and enjoyment by invading the wealth of the capitalists.

Coming down to the more concrete and practical side of the subject, he thinks there may be developed an "art which uses working rules, or laws, drawn from the repetitions of history to sway present civilization in the direction of progress". Due allowance must be made for "variations and the unexpected". He distinguishes this art from sociology and asks permission to coin a word from the Greek verb "to rule, or govern," and call it "Cratics". Permission is hereby peremptorily declined. The firecracker sound is forbidding and the meaning not obvious. Seriously speaking, "lessons from history" is after all the better designation of the subject. History is full of instruction and consolation, but so varied have been the conditions of its incidents that attempts to classify examples under rules will be far from exact, and the application to present or future will be at the constant risk of sacrificing truth to the logic of a system.

J. M. VINCENT.

Problems of Citizenship. By Hayes Baker-Crothers, Director of the Course in Problems of Citizenship at Dartmouth College, and Ruth Allison Hudnut. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1924, pp. xiv, 514, $2.75.) Some colleges are now substituting for an introductory course in history a composite course made up largely of economics, political science, and sociology. The advocates of the new proposal believe that a greater effort should be made to prepare students to take part in public affairs. Mr. Baker-Crothers has for several years been in charge of a "gateway" course; and the book before us is based on his experience. His theory is that students may best be interested in public affairs through a discussion of some of the leading problems of citizenship. To satisfy the appetite aroused by discussion, the students will later in their college course study the social sciences with serious purpose.

Discussion of seven problems makes up the body of this textbook—industrial maladjustment, feminism, international relations, immigration,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the negro, civil liberties, and the press. The point of view, logic, and style used in the discussion remind one of our weekly journals of protest. Every effort is made to arouse the reader to indignation against the injustices of life in the world as it is. One misses the note of optimism which seems to some at least a *sine qua non* of a disposition to exert oneself for social betterment. The section on feminism is particularly depressing. Man's inhumanity to woman seems likely to continue to make countless millions mourn. A bibliography of about nine hundred titles will give the reader an ample opportunity to see various sides of the problems.

In the preface the authors tell us that economics and political science contribute to the discussion of the problems, and leave us with the impression that a course based on the book will serve as an introduction to the further study of these sciences. Most economists and political scientists are likely to say that this is an admirable introduction to the study of sociology. Just as one misses the note of hopefulness which should come from a serious study of history, so one will have difficulty in finding in the book an introduction to a scientific statement of wisely organized industry or social control. Budget reform, a decent ballot, taxation, lawmaking, judicial practices: all of these are current social problems toward the solution of which real progress is being made. Yet the authors have almost nothing to say about them. They may answer that students aroused to a sense of indignation against social injustice will rush on to further studies which will take them into scientific economics and politics. Whether they are right is after all a matter of opinion.

EDGAR DAWSON.

Ancient Hunters and their Modern Representatives. By W. J. Sollas, Sc.D., Professor of Geology and Palaeontology in the University of Oxford. Third edition, revised. (London, Macmillan and Company; New York, Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. xxxv, 689, 25 s.) The third edition of Professor Sollas's well-known work is thoroughly rewritten and brought up to date. The general plan of the book remains unchanged, but the additions are many and important. It pictures human prehistory from its beginnings in dim eolithic time to the close of the palaeolithic period.

The chapter on the much discussed eoliths is excellent, much of it new. The study of the terraces containing palaeolithic remains in western Europe shows great advance in their correlation, aiding a much more reliable dating of their remains. Thus the Heidelberg jaw is now considered somewhat less ancient than we have thought. The description of palaeolithic art is full and good. The book is well illustrated. It closes with an excellent chapter on the chronology of the final retreat of the ice sheet in northern Europe at the close of palaeolithic time.

The conspicuous feature of the book is the attempt to discover and describe still surviving races as kinsmen of those of the successive palaeo-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lithic epochs, and which still retain and display the structures and customs of these bygone days. This method gives clearness and vividness to his portrayal of human life during these epochs. It is very successful, and perhaps hardly venturesome, when late palaeolithic Azilian man is compared with the Eskimo. The Bushman may have been akin to the negroid (?) remains found alongside those of the Cro-Magnon peoples in Aurignacean burials. They very possibly or even probably have pushed southward in or even through Africa. How much of the prevailing and leading structure and culture of that age did they ever possess or carry with them? How far does or did the Tasmanian resemble ancient eolithic man, of whom we know almost nothing? Professor Sollas seems to keep aware of the risks he is taking and to be cautious, but it remains a venturesome experiment.

The Occident and the Orient. Lectures on the Harris Foundation, 1924. By Sir Valentine Chirol. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1924, pp. xi, 228, $2.00.) The main theme of Sir Valentine Chirol's book is to describe the "general movement of revolt throughout the Orient against the ascendancy of the Occident on the plea either that it has learned all that the Occident can teach it, or that all the lessons of the Occident are a snare and an illusion". Such a theme is not primarily historical. It is one for which the septuagenarian's career as clerk in the British Foreign Office, as energetic and persistent traveller, and as Director of the Foreign Department of the London *Times* has particularly well fitted him.

Sir Valentine confines his discussion mainly to the reaction of Arabs, Turks, and Indians against the Western impact. Recognizing that religion is still a vigorous and vital force in the world, he begins by narrating briefly the story of Mohammedanism. This leads naturally into the history of the Ottoman Turks, and serves as a general introduction to the discussion of recent events in Egypt and India, with briefer notices of Morocco, Iraq, Syria, and Palestine. A final chapter outlines the rise and activity of Bolshevism, with special attention to the influence of Russia under this new aspect upon Persia and Afghanistan. Sir Valentine is clear and frank in his statements. He distributes praise and blame impartially and, though proud of what his country has done in general as a civilizing force, he nevertheless points out vigorously though calmly what he considers to have been serious errors in British policy.

One need not be surprised to find that Sir Valentine's description and interpretation of current conditions is more accurate and reliable than his statements and opinions as regards past events. In the matter of presenting dates there are errors of a few years on pages 20, 21, and 35. Among statements open to challenge are that Rumania is a Slav Balkan state (p. 36); and that the Committee of Union and Progress substituted the word "justice" for "equality" in the famous triple phrase, instead of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adding it to the other three words (p. 49). Perhaps the points to which most vigorous exception can be taken are in the interpretation of the motives for the great discoveries. One should not state flatly that "When the Ottoman Empire grew up, it blocked one by one the old Asian land routes of European trade with the Orient", nor should one affirm of the Spaniards and Portuguese that they made the great adventure "in the sole hope of discovering a new trade route across the seas to the legendary wealth of the Indies".

Mistakes are few, however, and the book is one of genuine excellence for its calm, thorough, and satisfying explanation of a considerable number of important world movements through which old profound forces reveal themselves in active current phases. A. H. LYBYER.

Medieval People. By Eileen Power, M.A., D.Litt., Lecturer in History at the London School of Economics and Political Science. (London, Methuen; Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924, pp. xii, 216, 6 s.) This unpretending book is a welcome addition to the not large group of volumes which undertake to "humanize" bygone history. The author is a lecturer in the London School of Economics and Political Science, and throughout there is evidence of a marked power of presentation backed by a sound and varied scholarship. She has proffered here a series of sketches "to illustrate at the same time various aspects of Social Life in the Middle Ages and various classes of historical material", and marked success has crowned her endeavor.

Miss Power has accomplished her purpose by six somewhat disconnected biographical studies of "Bodo, a Frankish Peasant of the Time of Charlemagne"; "Marco Polo, a Venetian Traveller of the Thirteenth Century"; "Madame Eglentyne, Chaucer's Prioress in Real Life"; "The Ménagier's Wife, a Paris Housewife in the Fourteenth Century"; "Thomas Betson, a Merchant of the Staple in the Fifteenth Century"; and "Thomas Paycocke of Coggeshall, an Essex Clothier in the Days of Henry VII." Marco Polo is of course a sufficiently famous worthy, but most of the others will be additions to the name-lists of many half-initiated students of the Middle Ages.

The study of Bodo (who is not much more than a lay figure) involves an ingenious and helpful reconstruction of the rural life in the age of Charlemagne, but it is to be regretted that no typical character, who was neither cleric nor cavalier, could have been selected to illustrate the long period between A. D. 800 and 1268. The later studies in the volume, which are perhaps the most original, bring us close to the threshold of modern times.

The illustrations add to the value of the discussions. No one can pretend that fourteenth-century illustrators of manuscript did not have a keen sense of humor, after he has examined the picture "The Ménagier's Wife cooks his Supper with the Aid of his Book!"

WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

La Vie en France au Moyen Age, de la Fin du XII^e au Milieu du XIV^e Siècle, d'après des Romans Mondains du Temps. Par Ch.-V. Langlois. (Paris, Hachette, 1924, pp. xxviii, 392, 25 fr.) Since this is a new and revised edition (with altered title) of the author's well-known work, *La Société Française au XIII^e Siècle d'après Dix Romans d'Aventure,* which was first published in 1903, the present notice may, for the most part, be confined to indicating the more important changes which have been made. The plan and method of the work are unchanged; and the analyses of plots are still, as is inevitable, sometimes a little tedious, and the abundant quotations from the sources sometimes make difficult reading for one who has not an uncommon familiarity with the French language of the period. But the book is packed with significant details and gives a "close-up" picture of medieval French society such as can not be had elsewhere, and it is in fact invaluable. The subject-matter has been considerably altered and expanded. Of the original ten romances, one, *Gautier d'Aupais,* has now been omitted; and there have been added one romance, *Jehan et Blonde,* and three stories (*contes*), *Le Chevalier Blanc, Le Chevalier à la Manche, Les Trois Dames de Paris.* Thus the new work is considerably larger than the old; and there have been changes in the order of treatment. Bibliographical and critical data with respect to each of the thirteen pieces studied have been brought strictly up to date. An appendix marshals strong arguments in favor of the identification of the great minstrel, Jean Renart, probable author of *Galeran, L'Escoufle,* and *Guillaume de Dôle,* with Renart of Dammartin en Goële. The bibliographical appendix entitled "Travaux sur l'Histoire de la Vie en France au Moyen Age d'après les Sources Littéraires" has been brought up to date and enlarged by the addition of more than one hundred titles. The value and interest of the book have been enhanced and its appearance has been much improved by the addition of twenty-five full-page illustrations, all selected with care and discrimination from illuminated manuscripts, monuments, or other artistic objects of the period.

C. W. David.

The Rise of Universities. By Charles Homer Haskins, Gurney Professor of History and Political Science, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University. [The Colver Lectures in Brown University, 1922.] (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1923, pp. ix, 134, $1.50.) These lectures, delivered at Brown University in 1922, constitute the best brief survey of medieval universities and university life to be found in English. Professor Haskins speaks with the authority of a specialist in this field, but the solid erudition underlying his treatment of the subject is concealed from the casual eye by a touch of humor and a literary charm that are seldom met with in discussions of medieval learning. The three lectures deal respectively with the origin and characteristics of the earliest universities; the medieval teacher and his methods

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of instruction; and the interest, activities, and ways of life of the students. Technical details of university organization are omitted, but nowhere else will the general reader obtain so clear and interesting an account of mediæval education as in these lectures which, at the same time, suggest a searching criticism of our own ideals by their reference to modern conditions and by the comparison of American conceptions with those of the earlier period. In many ways this little book will be found of great value to all who seek a realistic comprehension of the intellectual life of the Middle Ages.

Bohemond I., Prince of Antioch. By Ralph Bailey Yewdale. ([Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1924], pp. vi, 143, $2.00.) Those familiar with Chalandon's brilliant essay on Alexius Comnenus [1] will welcome this work as a corrective on certain important points. It seems clearly established that Alexius had definite obligations to the crusaders and that after Nicaea these obligations were not fulfilled. The facts may not furnish entire justification for Bohemond's self-aggrandizement at Antioch, but they lend a touch of poetic justice to the spectacle of Greek meeting Norman. The picture of Bohemond drawn in these pages, while laudatory, is also critical and is more complete than any hitherto presented. It quite supplants the excellent study by Kugler,[2] for the author has brought together additional material borrowed from local chronicles, popular literature, numismatics, and archaeology. All in all, he has managed to reconstruct with vividness and completeness another figure in the Norman hall of fame, a figure justly ranked beside William the Conqueror, Guiscard, and Roger.

At first glance it seems a bit far fetched to ascribe to Bohemond the ambitious project of establishing a Norman empire in the eastern Mediterranean which should include Byzantium as well as Syria. His disastrous experiences with Alexius in the Balkans and in Syria would seem little calculated to encourage such hopes. Bohemond's was a venturesome and fertile mind, however, and the idea may well have found lodgment in it. The author makes a plea to have Bohemond's expedition of 1107 counted as a crusade rather than as the blind discharge of a grudge against Alexius, but he has not removed the impression long held that it was precisely the confusion of these two ideas which led to the expedition's tragic undoing. Antioch, however, was saved to the Latins, though it was Tancred, not Bohemond, who saved it.

In this work one occasionally senses an undue joy in the methods of historical technique, but it was originally composed as a doctoral dissertation and such emphasis is therefore easily pardoned. In general the study betrays unusual insight and judgment as well as felicity of expression.

[1] Ferdinand Chalandon, *Essai sur le Règne d'Alexis 1er Comnène, 1081–1118* (Paris, 1900).

[2] Bernhard Kugler, *Boemund und Tankred, Fürsten von Antiochien: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Normannen in Syrien* (Tübingen, 1862).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The ability displayed by the author only sharpens the regret of all at the too early closing of so promising a career. All students of the period will acknowledge a debt to Professor D. C. Munro, who saw this book through the press.

A. C. KREY.

Cartulaire des Iles Normandes. (Jersey, Beresford, 1924, pp. xviii, 494.) This publication of the Société Jersiaise is a collection of the first importance for the history of the Channel Islands and for English and American genealogists. The documents are chiefly of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, though there is a fair sprinkling from the earlier period. They are taken primarily from the archives of the neighboring Norman monasteries at St. Lô, on the basis of copies made by the departmental archivist many years ago, but search has also been made at Paris, at Caen, and in England. The editors, whose work improves as the work advances, seem to have covered the material with reasonable thoroughness. We find, however, no reference to the copies of Pierre Mangon at Grenoble or the documents concerning Héauville published in the *Revue Catholique de Normandie* (VII.–XI.). The original of no. 169 is in the British Museum (Add. Ch. 15281). So nos. 114 and 115 are printed from a *vidimus* of 1270 instead of from the original, of which a facsimile is given. Much of the material here printed has been published or calendared before, and we miss any systematic indication of such facts. So the detailed index might well have been supplemented by a chronological list. There are thirteen good facsimiles of charters and seals.

C. H. H.

Calendar of Early Mayor's Court Rolls preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall, A. D. 1298–1307. Edited by A. H. Thomas, M.A. (Cambridge, University Press, 1924, pp. xlv, 304, 15 s.) The nine mayor's court rolls in this volume have not appeared in print before and they contain much of value for the later thirteenth century. They are the earliest extant records of the mayor's court, although we know from other sources that this court was in existence much earlier than the reign of Edward I. Curiously enough, also, these nine rolls are practically the only survivals of the original rolls of the mayor's court during its long existence. Fortunately records of some of the proceedings of the court during the later Middle Ages have been preserved in the letter-books of the city of London, calendared by Dr. R. R. Sharpe, and others are to be found in the still unpublished plea and memoranda rolls of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The editor of this *Calendar,* Mr. A. H. Thomas, is a former Cambridge don who now fills the important position of clerk of the records in the archives of the city of London at the Guildhall. His introduction to

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the present volume shows most scholarly knowledge of English municipal history in general and of the history of London in particular. The position of the mayor's court and its relations with the court of husting and with the sheriff's court are discussed at considerable length. Then follows an account of the procedure of the mayor's court in regard to plaints, mainprise and bail, proof by oath helpers, wager of law, trial by witnesses, and trial by jury.

The calendar of court rolls itself occupies 264 pages and contains much of great value for English medieval history in addition to a wealth of purely legal information. Space forbids any extended discussion, but mention should be made of the value of this collection for economic and social history as well as for municipal government. The origin and regulations of the London craft-guilds; relations between masters, journeymen, and apprentices; London trade and commerce with the Continent; maritime law; Teutonic and Italian traders, merchants, and bankers in London, are a few of the many interesting topics found in the text of these court rolls.

The volume is fairly adequately indexed as to names and subjects and is admirably printed.

N. M. Trenholme.

Au Jardin des Tuileries: l'Art du Jardin, la Promenade Publique. [Paris: la Vie et son Cadre.] Par Marcel Poëte. (Paris, Auguste Picard, 1924, pp. 359, 15 fr.) No one is better fitted to write of the city of Paris in its historic aspects than M. Marcel Poëte. As director of the Institut d'Histoire, de Géographie, et d'Économie Urbaines de la Ville de Paris he speaks with authority; and this, his latest book, though lacking foot-notes and a bibliography, is a work of erudition, the popularization of a scholar. The subtitle—*L'Art du Jardin, la Promenade Publique*—indicates its twofold character, for in tracing the history of the Jardin des Tuileries he not only outlines the history of the development of the formal garden, but also shows how it reflects the interests of successive monarchs and at the same time pictures the French Renaissance as it developed under Italian influence. The site—to take but one example—was chosen in the first place by Francis I. in the effort to find a healthier place of abode for his mother, for whom the neighborhood of the Hôtel des Tournelles was too damp and unsavory; while the garden itself was developed by Catharine de' Medici, influenced in all probability by a desire to get away from the place where her husband had died. Naturally enough she followed Italian models. Thus, like the whole movement of the French Renaissance, the garden copied the Italian and was closely connected with royalty.

"Il apparaît . . . comme un organe nouveau répondant à une fonction nouvelle. Il correspond à des besoins de vie sociale que la Renaissance a fait naître et qui se sont accrus à la suite de l'essor de notre pays après

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

les guerres de religion. Alors, la diffusion du luxe, le développement des relations mondaines, l'extension prise par la circulation en carrosses ont donné à la vie extérieure une impulsion que marque cette nouveauté: la promenade publique" (p. 328). It is this aspect which gave to the garden its permanent historical interest as the setting for the "*comédie humaine*".

Lectures on Holland. Delivered in the University of Leyden during the first Netherlands Week for American Students, July 7–12, 1924. (Leyden, A. W. Sijthoff, 1924, pp. 119.) As mentioned in a previous number (XXIX. 404) the University of Leyden maintained last July a "Netherlands Week" for American students, during which eight lectures were given in English, by eminent professors of the university, intended to expound to English-speaking students the essentials of historical and political knowledge respecting the Netherlands. These lectures have now been printed in a volume, and furnish an interesting, and in some respects valuable, introduction to an understanding of the country and its position. Professor J. Huizinga gives a brilliant exposition of How Holland became a Nation. The professor of international law, W. J. M. van Eysinga, sets forth with great acuteness and wisdom the Place of Holland among the Nations. Professor Colenbrander discourses on the Indian Empire of the Netherlands, Professor Eekhof on Religious Thought and Life in Holland (assuming, we should fear, more knowledge of theological history than most of his hearers would be likely to possess), and on the Latest Discoveries about the History of the Pilgrim Fathers, Professor Blok on Motley, Professor W. Martin on the National Element in Dutch Art. The volume is concluded by a lecture entitled "The Land of Grotius", by Professor C. van Vollenhoven, in which he very skillfully and interestingly relates the life of the founder of modern international law to the history of his country in his time and its present international position. There are some good illustrations. The English is remarkably good, for the work of persons to whom that is not the native language, but might have been improved by English or American revision.

Chronicles of the Eighteenth Century, founded on the Correspondence of Sir Thomas Lyttelton and his Family. By Maud Wyndham. In two volumes. (London, Hodder and Stoughton; Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924, pp. xxiii, 264; vii, 330, 30 s.) As a mirror of the eighteenth century, these volumes are of some interest—though less than one might expect. The Lytteltons were a numerous and highly respected family, having contacts with both the political and the literary worlds; and the ample resources and social standing of Sir Thomas gave his children the opportunity of achieving whatever position they merited—perhaps a little better. Unfortunately the only one who seems to have united

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

force with a measure of ability was the illegitimate son, Thomas Smith, who acquitted himself creditably in the navy and rose to be an admiral. Sir George (afterwards Lord) Lyttelton, the best known of the family, is more likely to be remembered for his early connection with Pitt than for his sorry accomplishments as a minister under Newcastle, but his literary tastes (or perhaps his rather vapid poetry) made him the casual friend of Pope, Swift, and (especially) Thomson. One might expect that he would sometimes deliver himself of keen observations on his society and times, but it is not always within the power even of clever people to write interesting letters, and Sir George was admitted by his contemporaries to be excessively tiresome. For vivacity one turns rather to a few letters of young "salts" like Samuel Hood.

Miss Wyndham can hardly be blamed if her material (from which Phillimore had already gleaned a little[1]) is sometimes dull. But, in undertaking to portray a whole family, together with several of their friends (usually assigned to separate chapters), she has been forced frequently to depart from the general course of the narrative, which is still further impeded by the method of interpolating letters or extracts of letters throughout the work. The result of all these circumstances is to give the reader a rather disjointed impression of a very commonplace group of persons. Yet the book is not without its value as a cinema of the country gentry—whether studying at Oxford or visiting a Cornish inn, whether pulling strings for office, or commanding a frigate, or contracting for a marriage.

It remains to point out some of the features of more direct historical interest. There is no evidence to verify Shelburne's story that the "Cousinhood" meditated forming an opposition in the event of Pelham's death, but were betrayed by Lyttelton; and indeed we find very little to add to our knowledge of Pitt. But we are indebted to the author for Bolingbroke's opinion of Wyndham, for some side-lights on the chicanery of Leicester House, for an exceedingly interesting estimate of Louis XV. (written by Sir George from France), for various contemporary impressions of the American war (including Braddock's defeat), and for an account of Byng's battle off Minorca by an under-officer, who states, among other things, that the morale of the fleet before going into action was excellent. The author's narrative, which is little more than a frame for her selections from the family papers, shows a competent grasp of her subject. The "Empress of Austria" and her diplomatic relations furnish perhaps the only exception to this statement.

T. W. Riker.

Ennio Quirino Visconti e la sua Famiglia. By Giovanni Sforza. [Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria, vol. LI.] (Genoa, the Society, 1923, pp. 235.) The Società Ligure di Storia Patria has admittedly

[1] R. J. Phillimore, *Memoirs and Correspondence of George, Lord Lyttelton* (London, 1845).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

departed from one of its traditions in this, the fifty-first volume of its publications, and also, one regrets to say, from some of its standards.

Ennio Quirino Visconti (1751–1818) was the son of Giambattista Visconti, the successor of Winckelmann as prefect of antiquities in the Museo Pio-Clementino under both popes. The volume before us covers in detail every phase of the career of this remarkable man. Boy prodigy submitted to public exhibitions of his extraordinary talents, youthful poet and translator into verse of Euripides and Pindar, he became a doctor in both laws at twenty as an unwilling step toward the cardinalate under paternal and papal patronage, from which he obstinately turned despite loss of present benefices and of future preferment in order to marry ultimately Teresa Doria. In his disgrace he was fortunately made the librarian and protégé of Prince Sigismondo Chigi, then "la provvidenza degli uomini ragguardevoli per intelligenza che si trovano a Roma", and was recalled at last by his father's illness to many years of labor in the completion of the seven great volumes describing the treasures of the papal museum while holding the posts of conservator of the Museo Capitolino and custodian of the Biblioteca Vaticana. There followed a brief and inglorious episode as a patriot, minister, and consul of the short-lived Roman republic, brought to a close by his enforced flight before the Neapolitan army from Rome to Paris in 1799. Welcomed there as one of the leading archaeologists of the world, he was made *conservateur des statues* in the Louvre. Until his death he was chiefly occupied, partly in collaboration with his fellow refugees, the Piranesi, in the preparation and publication of the descriptions of the newly garnered treasures of the Louvre, capped by his *Iconographie Grecque* in 1808 and *Iconographie Romaine* in 1817, while in the meantime he wrote brochures and letters by the score on subjects so diverse as the costume in which the First Consul should be portrayed by Chaudet in the statue ordered in 1804, the merits of the figure of an Aztec priestess found in America, and the merit and pecuniary value of the Elgin marbles, which, with other savants, he was summoned to appraise at the time of the purchase for the British Museum.

The book is as detailed as it is uncritically eulogistic, replete with long quotations from the hundreds of writings from Visconti's pen. It departs from the traditions of the society's publications in that it includes no unedited documents (apparently none of Visconti's writings, however minute, have escaped publication). It departs from the standard hitherto set by the society in that the proof-reading, accomplished to be sure as is apologetically stated in the preface under adverse conditions after the death of the author, still remains inexcusably bad; and in that the paper and printing are inferior. The bibliographical foot-notes appear exhaustive. It is a not uninteresting life of a great archaeologist, one whose life-work was of real importance in the history of art and letters and one whose name only passed from common reference in the field of iconography after the perfection of the camera.

EUGENE H. BYRNE.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Iron and Steel in the Industrial Revolution. By Thomas Southcliffe Ashton, M.A., Senior Lecturer in Economics in the University of Manchester. (Manchester, University Press; London and New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1924, pp. xi, 266, 15 s.) The author has examined the principal previous writings in his field (the eighteenth-century forge and foundry industries), and has had access to extensive local records that are extremely valuable and little known. Hence the student in quest of bibliographical aid has special reason to deplore the omission of a separate bibliography and the condensation of notes. But readers in general may well be grateful for a monograph with an unusually attractive style and with material additions to knowledge.

The author shows, for instance, in his discussion of the epochal changes in technique, that smelting with coke is traceable to the first Abraham Darby, early in the eighteenth century, though the general adoption of the process was admittedly delayed till late in the century. The peculiar relations between the iron and steel industries and the various wars are discussed at length. The price agreements and other organized activities of the iron-masters indicate a slighter development of individualism and competition than has commonly been supposed. The discussion of the views of the manufacturers concerning public policy is in general enlightening, but the admittedly faltering steps of the early great industrialists toward economic liberalism are unduly minimized because prompted by "self-interest" and "expediency". The author emphasizes the view that the attempts to regulate the colonial iron industry resulted mainly from political expediency in dealing with Sweden and Russia rather than from consistent principles of public policy. Though interestingly developed, the idea is perhaps overemphasized. Difficulties in securing iron from Sweden and Russia furnished the occasions, but the policies adopted with reference to colonial iron may properly be viewed as parts of a measurably consistent imperial scheme for maintaining complementary economic relations between the colonies and the home country. The leading figures in the iron industry are pictured in a manner which gives a sense of reality to them as individuals (a virtue rare in books of this type), and which at the same time shows their larger significance. Perhaps the least satisfactory part of the book is the single chapter devoted to the iron-workers—an extremely difficult subject.

In most respects the book fills a serious gap satisfactorily. The University of Manchester Press is to be congratulated on adding to its list of valuable publications on modern English economic history another book which careful students in its field will find indispensable.

WITT BOWDEN.

Le Mouvement Ouvrier à Paris pendant la Révolution Française (1789–1791). Par Grace M. Jaffé, Docteur de l'Université de Paris. (Paris, Félix Alcan, [1924?], pp. 222, 12.50 fr.) This brief work de-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scribes the condition of the working-class of Paris during the first years of the Revolution, and especially the incidents in the spring of 1791 which led to the passage of the Chapelier law on June 14. It adds materially to our knowledge of little known movements in the labor world of the time. The author, utilizing the documents preserved in the archival collections at Paris, gives an interesting account of the group of the journeymen carpenters, whose meetings at the Archevêché started the controversy. They aimed to establish a minimum wage of 50 *sous* a day. The essential question is whether the Chapelier law was, as Karl Marx asserted, a "coup d'état bourgeois", a notable stroke in the effort of the middle class to turn the Revolution to its own economic advantage. The author finds it strange, if this were the case, that neither Robespierre nor Marat should have attacked the legislation. Her own opinion is that while the law shows that the bourgeoisie, triumphant over the nobility, meant to assure its supremacy over the working-classes, other motives were influential. The framers of the law were under the domination of Physiocratic ideas and believed that nothing which contravened natural liberty in industry should be permitted. They were also affected by the repeated assertions that the journeymen were using violence in preventing other laborers from working below the minimum which they had set. These fears, the author believes, were without foundation. She has found no case of a workman arrested for violence or riot. On the whole the author's attitude is objective, although she seems less critical of testimony against the employers than of that against the employees. One exception is her adoption, in explaining the high cost of living, of the baseless suggestion of Monin that Necker may have speculated in grain to government account in the winter of 1788–1789, using the profits to diminish the danger of bankruptcy.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

La Révolution Française. Par Albert Mathiez, Professeur d'Histoire Moderne à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Dijon. Tome II. *La Gironde et la Montagne.* (Paris, Armand Colin, 1924, pp. 223, 6 fr.) The "avertissement", volume I. (reviewed in this journal, XXVIII. 356–357), states that this "livre . . . est établi sur une documentation étendue, parfois même inédite, interprétée par une critique indépendante", and that the second volume will end with July 27, 1794, and the third volume with the creation of the Empire. The second volume might just as well have been entitled *La Gironde,* for it covers the period from August 10, 1792, to June 2, 1793, only. It is an exposition of the plans and failures of the Girondists. The Mountain and its supporters are left too much in the background. Their activities are praiseworthy. The facts are made to tell the story in an admirably historical way. There is just enough of running comment to make the reader suspect that Robespierre is going to be the hero and statesman and Danton the villain

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and traitor. The third volume will be looked for with much eagerness. The story is exceedingly well told. It is as interesting as a novel. The Girondists are depicted as doomed to destruction. They lacked real leadership and they vacillated when decisive action was imperative. They misunderstood the conditions and neglected them while practising crooked politics. They plotted to gain political domination. They worked against the Mountain party, the Jacobin Club, the Parisian municipal organizations and influence in France, and the poorer classes. They adopted more and more reactionary policies.

CARL CHRISTOL.

Private Papers of George, second Earl Spencer, First Lord of the Admiralty, 1794–1801. Edited by Rear-Admiral H. W. Richmond. Volume IV. [Publications of the Navy Records Society, vol. LIX.] (London, the Society, 1924, pp. v, 320, 18 s. 6 d.) This fourth and final volume of the selections from the papers of Lord Spencer has the same defects in arrangement commented upon in this *Review* in notices of the preceding volumes (*e.g.*, XXIX. 797). The items in the fourth volume are from the same chronological interval as those in the third, namely, the years 1797–1801. In fact the editor treated the contents of these two volumes as a single body of material, and the general introduction in the third volume relates also to the contents of the fourth. This last volume contains papers grouped under the topics "St. Vincent and his Officers, 1799–1800", "The Mediterranean, 1798–1801", "The Indian Waters, the Red Sea and Cape of Good Hope, 1797–1801", "The Northern Powers, 1800–1801", and "General Correspondence, 1800–1801". The papers relating to operations in the Mediterranean, which make up more than one-third of the bulk of the volume, are arranged in subdivisions under the topics "General Correspondence, January to July 1799", "Sidney Smith in the Levant, October 1798 to December 1800", and "Lord Keith, December 1799 to March 1801".

The papers in the fourth volume perhaps more than those in any of the others are of interest to students of other than purely naval history. There are interesting items illustrating the manner in which the Cabinet functioned in making war. For example, Dundas as secretary of state wrote in the last days of 1800 to Sir Ralph Abercrombie, having first obtained the king's approval, giving to that commander discretion to decline to go forward with a military expedition then in contemplation if Spencer would not in the meantime substitute another naval commander for Lord Keith. This letter was sent to Spencer for his information before it was despatched and was apparently intended as much for the Admiralty as for the general to whom it was addressed as a private communication. This volume also contains items of interest to students of the larger strategy of the war and of foreign and imperial policy, especially as regards Asia and Africa.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

L'Angleterre au XIX^e Siècle: son Évolution Politique. Par Léon Cahen, Docteur ès Lettres, Professeur aux Lycées Condorcet et Fénelon. (Paris, Armand Colin, 1924, pp. 204, 6 fr.) This compactly written little manual seems to be admirably suited to the purposes for which it is intended, namely, as an introduction to recent English history for students in French lycées. The narrative is organized in three parts with three or four chapters in each part. The first part, "La Ruine de la Vieille Angleterre", treats of the political history in the period from the latter part of the eighteenth century to 1830; the second, "L'Angleterre Libre-Échangiste", from the Reform Bill of 1832 to that of 1867; the third, "L'Angleterre Démocratique", the period since 1867. The concluding chapter deals with contemporary conditions. The material in the book is on the whole well selected and the generalizations are characterized by more insight than might be expected in a work based almost entirely, if one may judge from the bibliography, on authorities in French, either books by native French writers or French translations of British or American books. A few titles in English are suggested, but some of them seem to be books that chanced to be at hand when the author was writing rather than those likely to be useful in a further study of the subject.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE.

Histoire Politique de l'Europe Contemporaine: Évolution des Partis et des Formes Politiques, 1814–1914. Par Charles Seignobos, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris. Septième Édition, entièrement refondue et considérablement augmentée. Tome I. (Paris, Armand Colin, 1924, pp. xiv, 536, 35 fr.) A revised edition of this work, first published in 1897, and for many years a classic in its field, has been long desired. Now that it has come, one is astonished at its thoroughness. Not only has the *terminus ad quem* been extended to 1914, giving us the record of a complete century's development; not only has the number of pages been increased by a fourth, requiring a division into two volumes (of which the first has now appeared), though this in itself would have been a considerable task; but more than this, scarcely a sentence of the original work remains unaltered. The insertion of a qualifying phrase here, of a whole new paragraph there, the breaking up of old paragraphs by new headings, considerable changes in the order of presentation, and the addition of material throughout, make this almost a new book. The bibliographies are brought up to date, but there is in this first volume no index; let us hope there will be one in the second.

The spirit of the history remains unchanged, as the preface indicates. "The conclusions have not varied since the first edition; the political evolution of Europe as I then described it, has, it seems to me, only continued and grown more rapid, while at the same time becoming more obvious." The tone remains severely objective. Indeed, M. Seignobos,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the most substantial addition to his preface, breaks a lance with the sociologists, who have criticized him for limiting himself too strictly to facts and being satisfied with superficial explanations; he reaffirms his conviction that chance and accident play as great a rôle in historical causation as does scientific law; hence his emphasis on revolutions. There is perhaps a slight softening in the author's dogmatism; occasionally the addition of new material has been at the expense of the crisp, epigrammatic succinctness which was so valuable a feature of the old book; in general, however, the new passages have been so skillfully woven in that the loss in compactness is not apparent.

It is obviously impossible to enumerate the changes in detail. Among the most striking is the insertion of two entirely new chapters on events in England and France, respectively, from 1897 to 1914; the former emphasizes social legislation and the Irish question, the latter the conflicts with the Church and with syndicalism. The chapter on Italy is expanded into two, most of the new material being on the Risorgimento and on party struggles of more recent date. The framework of the remaining chapters remains unaltered; to almost all, from one to eight pages have been added.

EUGENE N. CURTIS.

Englische Geschichte, 1815–1914. Von Carl Brinkmann. (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1924, pp. x, 212, 5 M.) This book is designed to impress upon German readers the continuity of England's world-wide interests and imperial outlook since 1815, side by side with the country's preoccupation over questions of internal change. Emphasizing the latter phase has left the study of English history, so the author thinks, in a distortion which he strives to correct. To this end he contrives to bring the work of the Foreign Office and of the Colonial Office into a closer relation with the rest of English political activity; and he prefers to regard this activity as a complex but indivisible whole, the component parts of which should be considered only simultaneously and in the closest association. In other words, he would drive home to his German readers the conclusion that England's interests in *Weltpolitik* and in the organization of an empire are as really and intimately phases of English politics as are the more immediate social and constitutional issues arising within England itself. This he has done most successfully.

In the small compass of two hundred-odd pages Herr Brinkmann has no room for the conflicting views of political parties; nor does he even hint at differences of opinion over imperial questions: his history is limited to an epitome of events. Restricted in scope as the narrative thus becomes, it proceeds, nevertheless, from the wide and accurate knowledge characteristic of intensive German research and which it is refreshing to meet once more. The documentation in particular rests upon a

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bibliography that comes close to meeting the fullest requirements of the subject; it is indeed gratifying to observe that full use has been made of the most recent American publications—such, for example, as the historical studies published in the name of Columbia and of Yale. Only when Herr Brinkmann enters upon the period of Edward VII. and alludes to the Anglo-French entente and the Anglo-Russian understanding does he fall from grace. He then becomes so obviously *pro patria* that he parts company with scholarship.

C. E. Fryer.

Histoire du Peuple Anglais au XIX^e^ Siècle. III. *De la Crise du Reform Bill à l'Avènement de Sir Robert Peel (1830–1841).* Par Élie Halévy, Professeur à l'École Libre des Sciences Politiques. (Paris, Hachette, 1923, pp. 339, 25 fr.) In this volume, the third of his projected *History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century,* Professor Halévy carries his narrative on from 1830 to 1841. It must be confessed that this new installment of the work, while not quite so perfunctory as volume II., does not come up to the expectations held out by the publication thirteen years ago of the introductory volume. That masterly and really brilliant analysis of the state of English society and politics in 1815 has made an established place for itself already. But the very strength of analysis which Professor Halévy there displays becomes an impediment in his later work, turning narrative into unnecessary and often purely rhetorical argumentation. Thus in the volume at hand the chapter on the passing of the Reform Bill is twisted in such a way as to make Reform in England appear as something incidental and subsidiary to an original impulsion from the July revolution in Paris. English readers will recognize at once that in this case a subject of great complexity has been most naïvely simplified. It is to be hoped that French readers will not accept at face value this artless version of historical cause and effect.

The documentation of the volume is based upon a bibliography completed about ten years ago, and to which nothing has been added since; but the references are taken to such an extent from out-of-the-way sources, and Professor Halévy has been so generous in printing his extracts, that this part of the work provides an interest stronger than that of the text itself. Of the five chapters which the book comprises, the third, dealing with the Church after 1832, best repays reading. On the relations between England and France, and in his remarks upon Palmerston, Professor Halévy is not at his best; he seems scarcely to realize that international provocation is seldom altogether one-sided. The description of Roebuck as a "young Canadian" (p. 98) is a further example of Professor Halévy's too clear-cut simplification. The brief and confusing article upon Roebuck in the *Dictionary of National Biography* may perhaps have been responsible for the adoption of the term; the circumstantial account of Roebuck's early life in Leader's biography makes the term inapplicable.

C. E. Fryer.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russlands Eintritt in den Weltkrieg: der Ausbau der Russischen Wehrmacht und ihr Einsatz bei Kriegsausbruch. Mit Genehmigung des Reichsarchivs und unter Benutzung amtlicher Quellen von Gunther Frantz. (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1924, pp. xi, 306.) Russia's military preparations and final mobilization orders have been one of the most difficult problems in connection with the immediate origins of the war. These difficulties arise from many causes: the false and contradictory statements made at the Sukhomlinov trial in 1917; the falsifications of the Russian *Orange Book* and the meagreness at this point of the French *Yellow Book*; and the extreme suppositions published by R. Hoeniger (see *Am. Hist Rev.*, XXVI. 225 ff.) on the basis of Russian military telegrams captured by the Germans during the war. At present, thanks to Baron Schilling's diary, Dobrorolski's memoir, and this volume of Gunther Frantz, the problem is much clarified. Frantz publishes in German translation in an appendix all the telegrams used by Hoeniger and a good many others. Though his study is primarily a technical military one, it necessarily deals to a considerable extent with politics and diplomacy. His conclusions are careful, moderate, and well documented. They are very damaging to Sazonov's reputation, leaving no doubt that he worked closely hand in hand with Janushkevitch, the Russian chief-of-staff. They also seem to confirm Sukhomlinov's almost incredible statement in his recent memoirs, that he, Sukhomlinov, although minister of war, had relatively little to do with the military decisions taken during the July crisis. The two really driving figures were Sazonov and Janushkevitch. The influence of the French ambassador, Paléologue, on Russian military decisions still remains somewhat obscure.

Up to 1912 Russia's military plans on her western frontier had been defensive in character. But thenceforth, owing in part to the pressure of the French, who wanted an immediate Russian attack on Germany if the latter made the feared invasion of France, Russia began to change from a defensive to an offensive plan of campaign. It was expected that this new plan, "No. 20", would be complete and supersede the old one on December 1/14, 1914. These expectations were overtaken by the suddenness with which the storm burst in July, so that only part of the new modifications were actually adopted. One of these was the measure known as "Period Preparatory to War", which provided for wide-reaching military preparations, short of mobilization, on the frontier against Germany. "Partial mobilization" was a diplomatic bluff, intended both as a possible means of frightening Austria to back down and as a convenient screen for moving troops from the interior which in reality were to be used on the frontier against Germany as well as against Austria. Upon the news of Austria's declaration of war on Serbia, Sazonov as well as the military leaders rejected the idea of partial, in favor of general, mobilization. The Tsar was persuaded to approve this on the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

morning of July 29; but on the evening of the same day, upon the receipt of a mediatory telegram from "Willy", cancelled his approval—to the utter dismay of Sazonov and the militarists. There is no truth in Sukhomlinov's statement at his trial that he proceeded secretly with general mobilization on the night of July 29 in defiance of the Tsar's orders. But on July 30, about 3 P.M., the Tsar was persuaded by Sazonov again to approve general mobilization, the telegrams for which were sent out shortly after 6 P.M. According to the doctrine, generally accepted by militarists everywhere in Europe, that "mobilization means war", the news of Russian general mobilization forced Germany to take similar measures and rendered war inevitable.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

The Industries of the Clyde Valley during the War. By W. R. Scott, M.A., D.Phil., Litt.D., LL.D., Adam Smith Professor of Political Economy in the University of Glasgow and Fellow of the British Academy, and J. Cunnison, M.A., Lecturer on Social Economics in the University of Glasgow. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Economic and Social History of the World War, James T. Shotwell, General Editor.] (London, Oxford University Press; New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press, 1924, pp. xvi, 224, 10 s.) This is a meaty book, filled with facts rather than generalizations, but with enough interpretation to illuminate its data. The object of the authors was to catch the image of the war-time Clyde before it faded from the spectator's retina. They have succeeded well enough to make their book a valuable contribution to contemporary history and economics.

Ten chapters describe in succession the Clyde Valley before the war: coal mining, iron and steel making, shipbuilding and engineering, munitions industries, miscellaneous manufacturing, commerce, labor, and social conditions during the war; and a number of attendant conditions grouped under the caption, Life and Industry during the War and After. In addition there are some twenty-five pages of documentary and statistical appendixes and an index.

The Clyde Valley is so self-contained socially and so well defined geographically that it is an excellent unit for such a study. It also presented in small area Britain's great war problems of securing food and raw materials from abroad, of serving foreign as well as domestic markets, of diluting highly organized labor with newcomers, and of transforming long-established industries to new uses.

Among the topics of continuing practical interest are illustrations of the effects of conscious social control over the economic life of the community as exhibited in government war regulation, of the influence of a sustained effort at maximum production upon conservative business and labor organizations and upon the arrangement and equipment of manufacturing plants, and of the seeming elasticity of the human element in

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

industry under strain. Naturally these are themes that can not be explored in a brief review; indeed, the book itself does not profess to do more than reconnoitre them.

Notwithstanding the extraordinary character of the war crisis, it seems to have caused a surprisingly small permanent deviation in the Clyde's industrial orbit. Or perhaps that deviation will be more obvious to future observers, with longer records to compute by. Old customs and conditions reasserted themselves with unexpected force and promptness as soon as war pressure was withdrawn. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose,* applies as truly here as it does elsewhere in human history. A hint of the underlying reason for this opens the concluding chapter of the book before us. "Already the memory of the life of the people during the war is becoming faint and blurred. This in fact is the inevitable consequence of a psychological law according to which, when both emotion and activity are most intense, the subsequent memory is faint."

Tours pendant la Guerre, 1914–1919. Par Michel Lhéritier. (Tours, Deslis; Paris, A. Costes, 1924, pp. 438.) Professor Lhéritier has produced a book which might well serve as a model for the writing of local war history. All phases of the life of Tours during the war are treated, political, economic, social, religious, etc., and the book as a whole is a valuable study of the effect of war upon local conditions. Of particular interest to American readers is the generous amount of space devoted to the account of the "occupation" of Tours by the American forces. Tours, it will be remembered, was the headquarters of the American services of the rear, and hardly any other town outside the zone of operations was as largely in American hands. Such a state of affairs could not fail to be accompanied by misunderstandings and a certain amount of friction, and it is wholesome for American readers to have the French view of such contacts placed before them. But Professor Lhéritier is exceedingly indulgent. His personal admiration for the Americans, and his gratitude for American participation in the war lead him usually to show a certain partiality for the "associated power" when it came in conflict with local authority. The book is highly readable and is well illustrated.

Greater France in Africa. By William Milligan Sloane, Member of the American Academy of Arts and Letters. (New York and London, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924, pp. xvi, 293, $3.00.) While we have a considerable list of authoritative historical, political, and economic works on French North Africa, much of it of quite recent date, very little has been published in English. The present work is the result of a five weeks' semi-official visit to countries which, because of their present and prospective commercial importance, are of great interest to America as well as to Europe.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The author has sketched the history of these countries, with particular reference to French activities, and, with appreciation of the difficulties of the tasks and of the success attained, has shown the justice of the political policy of France, the high aims and fine qualifications of the French administrators, and the resulting material benefits to the native population. He notes one of the fundamental reasons of French success when he quotes the words of the famous Resident General of Morocco: "We do not regard the native population of Morocco as an inferior race but as another race than ourselves."

It is unfortunate that the author did not make larger use of authoritative historical material. Many of his statements are incorrect or inexact and some are completely contradictory. His statement that "the members of the commission were almost bewildered with information of every sort. It required time and perspective to sort out the writer's mind," may account for some of the errors. It might be well, however, to note that the Djebala, west of the Riff, together with the plains extending to the Atlantic, from the Tangier Zone to an irregular line north of Ouezzan, including the cities of El Ksar and Larache, are included in the Spanish Protectorate, not the French as page 2 would suggest. On page 98 we are told that by the terms of the convention of December 18, 1923, a slice of the Tangier Zone was added to the Spanish Zone, while on page 143 we are told that the Tangier Zone was somewhat enlarged at the expense of Spain.

The statements (p. 33) with regard to President Roosevelt and the Algeciras Conference can scarcely be reconciled with the official documents and correspondence. The general remarks concerning the Mohammedan confraternities are misleading and of the Senussia in particular incorrect. The description of Guardaia (centre of a group of oases with a population of about 40,000) as a military forepost with no settlement nearer than Timbuctoo (to the south) is somewhat extraordinary, as any good map would show. On the whole, there are many statements which can only be taken with reserve.

The book is furnished with an index and two maps, one rather unsatisfactory.

GEORGE F. ANDREWS.

Curious Chapters in American History. By Humphrey J. Desmond, LL.D. (St. Louis, Mo., and London, B. Herder Book Company, 1924, pp. vi, 264, $1.50.) This little book deserves a different title. Its contents are not derived exclusively from the "curious" episodes and movements in American history. However, the appeal throughout is to the layman rather than the professional historian, the subject-matter those questions which are of interest to the average resident of Main Street or the fireside raconteur. The sweep is broad, the twenty-six chapters treating of incidents and movements from the time of Vespucci

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the presidential election of 1916. One learns something of such matters as the naming of America, the career of Captain Kidd, the Burr conspiracy, the Whitman legend, the case of Mrs. Surratt, and the Mulligan letters. To these and similar themes the institutional, economic, and social aspects of history are subordinated. Might we not well denominate such a book "A Layman's Impressions of American History", or "The Historical Viewpoint of Main Street"? Yet to the professional student the book has a value. It presents in readable form the findings of many monographs and a number of historians on important points. Hence it might well find a place on the reference shelf among works of general information. Moreover, it is an interesting bit of evidence showing how the results of the investigator's toil percolate down to the reading public.

WM. K. BOYD.

The Whig Party in Pennsylvania. By Henry R. Mueller, Ph.D., Professor of History in Muhlenberg College. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. CI., no. 2.] (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1922, pp. 271, $2.75.) Someone should write, as a companion volume to Professor Cole's *The Whig Party in the South,* an account of the northern wing of the Whig party. Such a study would help to explain the internal conflicts within the Whig party and the importance of the elections of 1844 and 1852 in Whig annals. If ever this is attempted, the investigator will find the present doctoral dissertation a useful guide to Pennsylvania politics.

The besetting sins of the Whigs were a proneness to compromise and an attempt to absorb within their folds a number of heterogeneous elements that could not be assimilated. The Pennsylvania Whigs revealed these weaknesses within their state organization. Jackson's bank war and the fear of executive usurpation gave the Whigs a definite programme of opposition; but the trouble over the recharter of the United States Bank, the disturbing activities of Stevens and the Antimasons, and the economic distress of the 'thirties caused the Whigs endless trouble. Not until after the Buckshot War, the final failure of the United States Bank, the subordination of the Antimasons to Whig dictation, and the election of Harrison did the state leaders feel confident. This security was shaken, however, by the disaffection within their ranks caused by the Native American movement, while the passage of the tariff of 1846, "by the aid of Texas Senators", made the party antislavery. Thereafter the opposition of Pennsylvania to the Southern element in the national organization became more pronounced, and the doom of the party was foreshadowed by the state contest of 1851 and the presidential election of 1852. The Kansas-Nebraska Bill and the Know-Nothing mania sealed the party's fate.

Dr. Mueller's monograph is based upon careful research in manuscript and published sources and is illustrated by a number of election maps.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are interesting side-lights on the careers of a number of leading Pennsylvanians and excellent descriptions of business pressure in political campaigns. The desire of Senator Dickey for a branch bank in Beaver County is a more plausible explanation of his conduct than the one given (p. 26). The value of the study is enhanced by a concluding summary chapter which alone gives the reader the impression that the writer had digested his material and is a pleasant relief from the sometimes tedious recital of state politics. The foot-notes often contain illuminating quotations from manuscript sources that could well have been included in the text.

REGINALD C. MCGRANE.

America of the Fifties: Letters of Fredrika Bremer, selected and edited by Adolph B. Benson. (New York, American-Scandinavian Foundation; London, Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. xx, 340, $2.00.) The sprightly and informing letters written by the Swedish novelist, Fredrika Bremer, during her journeys in the United States from 1849 to 1851 were brought out in an English translation by Mary Howitt in 1853 as a two-volume work of more than thirteen hundred pages. The volume under review consists of selections from these well-known letters, edited by Mr. Benson, with a brief introduction, two portraits of Miss Bremer, and a number of her pencil sketches. The American-Scandinavian Foundation is to be congratulated upon this publication, for it will serve effectively to popularize Miss Bremer's vivid contemporary account of the "America of the Fifties", with its interesting comments on Emerson, Lowell, Irving, Whittier, and other celebrities in the East, its sharply etched descriptions of conditions in the South, and its illuminating record of a journey to the Indian frontier of the Northwest. The book is not intended for scholars, who will naturally prefer to use the Swedish original or the Howitt translation of 1853. Mr. Benson's version of the letters is "revised and normalized from the original" Howitt translation, with numerous changes in punctuation and in words. He has selected for his book about one-fourth of the material in the original. Omissions of paragraphs are sometimes indicated by periods, but there is no consistency in this respect. The editor believes that the extracts are "representative of the *Letters* as a whole", but the omission of the less quotable material has perhaps given the volume a somewhat higher level of interest than that which characterizes the original. On the other hand, many of the omitted passages are of great value, and the original possesses a smoothness which is lost in the book of extracts. The editor's introduction is a useful little essay which gives the letters their proper setting. The volume lacks an index and there are no annotations.

THEODORE C. BLEGEN.

The Gadsden Treaty. By Paul Neff Garber, Ph.D., Instructor in History in Brown University. A Thesis presented to the Faculty of the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Graduate School. (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 1923, pp. ix, 222, maps.) This volume is a detailed study of the antecedents, the negotiation, the ratification, and the aftermath of the Gadsden Treaty. It is based upon a thorough examination of almost every source, published and unpublished, available in the United States. The public documents of the United States, the archives of the State Department, both diplomatic and consular, the private correspondence of American statesmen and diplomats who were in any way connected with the subject, and the files of the leading newspapers have all been diligently searched. The author has not investigated the Mexican archives, repeated efforts to secure access to these having proved unavailing. Failure in this respect has been largely atoned for, however, by documents drawn from the British Foreign Office and by a careful perusal of the notes to and from the Mexican Legation in Washington. Moreover, the memoirs of Santa Anna—under whose dictatorship the Gadsden Treaty was negotiated—have been published, as well as several other documents bearing upon the Mexican side of the question, and the author has made diligent use of these. Few will have anything but commendation for the industry with which Dr. Garber has assembled his materials.

His narrative, however, is not entirely satisfactory. His organization is at times faulty; there is occasionally a lack of precision and of variety in expression; and sometimes the writer fails to distinguish relevant from irrelevant facts. It should also be noted that the proof-reader has been guilty of an occasional oversight: for instance, "Rio Grande River" appears (pp. 3, 13) instead of merely Rio Grande, "1854" (p. 95) instead of 1853, and "James Forsythe" in place of John Forsyth; one observes an omission of two words on page 11 (line 5), of *Diez* from the title of a Mexican journal (p. 199), and of *Inéditos* from the title of a collection of Mexican documents (p. 198, item 5); and there are misprints in the last item on page 201.

On the whole, Dr. Garber has written a good book. His statements of fact are usually very accurate and his conclusions sound. Future students of the Gadsden Treaty will hardly find it worth while to go back in any extensive fashion to the sources which he has examined. After carefully reading his book they may be able to present the salient facts in a more readable narrative or to write a more satisfactory conclusion than the one which forms chapter VII., but many historians insist upon drawing their own conclusions, and Dr. Garber has presented the evidence with great care and exhaustiveness. This evidence indicates that the Gadsden Treaty had little connection with a conspiracy of the so-called "Slavocracy", that the United States sought much more territory in the fall of 1853 than it was able to persuade Santa Anna to sell, but that this dictator approached Gadsden in the summer of 1855 with another offer of territory and Gadsden was then apparently unwilling to bargain with him! It also shows that Santa Anna was not averse to seeking

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European support against the United States, but that Great Britain, at least, gave him little encouragement.

J. Fred Rippy.

The Negro in South Carolina during the Reconstruction. By Alrutheus Ambush Taylor, A.M. (Washington, D. C., Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1924, pp. iv, 341, $2.00.) In the last twenty years a vast amount of historical research has been done upon the period of Reconstruction. This has, however, been largely confined to the study of politics, national and state, and publication so far has failed to deal in a satisfactory manner with the problems of economic and social readjustment. Perhaps as a result of this concentration of interest the negro has been treated almost entirely as a lay figure. It was, therefore, a happy idea of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial to assist the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in enabling Mr. Taylor to study the period from the point of view of those conditions which most interest the negro.

Mr. Taylor is unfortunate in the attitude he takes in his introduction toward previous studies. They have, undoubtedly, failed in comprehensiveness, but one cannot admit any such sweeping indictment as that "Self-interest, then, impelled them to select such facts as would establish their point of view", or that they "are practically worthless in studying and teaching the history of the Reconstruction period" (p. 2). On the other hand, while Mr. Taylor's comments and adjectives fully indicate his sympathies, and that he has a case to present, he can not be accused of unfairness in the selection and presentation of his own material. His research has been diligent and sound, and his results will prove of interest to all students of the period. One regrets that more time was not taken in final preparation. The English is sometimes obscure and the construction confusing. The best chapters are those on education and religion. Throughout, the material is of the greatest value, and the book in its totality is convincing in its thesis that the story of Reconstruction is not yet told.

Carl Russell Fish.

Anglo-American Relations during the Spanish-American War. By Bertha Ann Reuter, Ph.D., Associate Professor in Wesleyan College, Georgia. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1924, pp. ix, 208, $1.75.) This volume of seven chapters, originally planned as a study in diplomatic relations by examination of governmental documents, was later enlarged in scope by the inclusion of expressions of contemporary public opinion relative to governmental action. It is really a sketch of Anglo-American *rapprochement* after the American Civil War, and especially in the decade after 1890.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first three chapters (60 pp.) present an introductory survey of the disappearance of antipathies which characterized Anglo-American relations for a century after American independence and readjustments in diplomatic relations. The third chapter (30 pp.), the Period of Transition, 1890–1897, especially emphasizes the fundamental importance of the Venezuelan controversy in establishing a basis for the durable friendship which later found expression in British support for the United States in the Spanish-American War, in American co-operation in the British open-door policy in China, and in the attempt to form a general Anglo-American agreement, or understanding for co-operation, in the Far East and in the Caribbean.

Miss Reuter produces no evidence to prove the existence of any Anglo-American alliance and makes no reference to any negotiations or arrangements which might have formed any basis for Roland Usher's earlier unproven statement.

The author's chief service is the presentation of useful information in convenient form for the student of foreign relations and the general reader, rather than the contribution of new information of large importance. The volume, however, bears evidence of diligence and industry in examination of newspapers and other printed sources. In addition to a liberal supply of foot-note references it contains an extensive bibliography (pp. 191–204), and it also has a brief general index. The bibliography contains a considerable list of primary sources but no unpublished materials, although the preface states that such materials were examined in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress.

A single typographical error, the use of the word "momentary" for "monetary", appears on page 46.

J. M. C.

Barrett Wendell and his Letters. By M. A. DeWolfe Howe. (Boston, *Atlantic Monthly* Press, 1924, pp. ix, 350, $4.50.) Mr. Howe is a very accomplished biographical writer, and in Barrett Wendell he has a subject made to his hand—a Boston-and-Harvard man, a literary man of real distinction, a friend, and apparently a former teacher—and to former students Wendell showed himself at his best, humane, considerate, and helpful. Mr. Howe describes him with candor, a fine, manly character, with a defective nervous system and a multitude of crotchets, most of them harmless, though one is prone to think that a man so conscious of them could have suppressed some of them if they had been less picturesque.

But for the most part the book consists of Wendell's own letters, largely letters of travel, very entertaining, or of literary criticism, often very acute, sometimes too subtle. The student of history may perhaps be most interested in the remarks on politics, which are often penetrating, always high-minded. They are, however, conceived from the peculiar

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point of view of the Boston Brahmin. A Boston Brahmin is a man one of whose great-grandfathers had what seemed to be a large amount of money in a small provincial city of 30,000 inhabitants one hundred or so years ago. That is all. But to Wendell such persons appeared to constitute a superior race, whose members of right ought to govern the United States. That the desires of two million people in Arkansas should have as much influence in the government as those of two million people in Massachusetts would have seemed to him monstrous. The workings of this tory prepossession are amusingly seen in a letter respecting the late Senator Lodge. Wendell's acute mind sees clearly all the Senator's deficiencies, but he will not admit them to himself, because, considering the Senator's origins, Wendell is bound to regard him as his ideal statesman.

Memoirs of the Harvard Dead in the War against Germany. Volume III. By M. A. DeWolfe Howe. Volumes IV. and V. By M. A. DeWolfe Howe and others. (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1922–1924, pp. v, 674; vi, 716; xii, 773, $4.00 each.) The monument to the Harvard dead has now been completed. Volumes I. and II. have already been reviewed in these pages (XXVI. 595; XXVII. 624). The remaining three volumes of the series are similar in scope, plan, and execution to the first two. The general editor, Mr. DeWolfe Howe, was compelled with the fourth volume to seek the assistance of various associates in writing the memoirs. Notwithstanding the composite authorship of these later volumes, the style and treatment are remarkably uniform. We may assume that these five volumes reveal a fairly typical cross-section of the vast army of university-bred men who were in the military and naval service during the Great War. It is interesting, therefore, to compile certain statistics from these memoirs. Of the 373 men who lost their lives, 109 were holders of degrees from other institutions of learning than Harvard; thirty-one had been born abroad, although most of these were American citizens; seven were born in Great Britain, nine in Canada, one in Australia, six in France, one in Italy, two in Japan, one in Russia, one in Greece, and three in Germany. Sixty-one were in the military or naval service of foreign countries: twenty-seven in the British service, fourteen in the Canadian, one in Australian, eighteen in French, and one in Japanese. One hundred and seventy-six received their death at the hands of the enemy: fifty-four, of whom thirty-three were aviators, lost their lives in accidents, 141 died of disease, and two were murdered. Two hundred and twenty-two of the deaths were in France; eighty of the men were in the aviation service in the United States, Great Britain, or France. The great majority of the others were in some form of combatant service.

Without doubt the most valuable part of the volumes from the point of view of the historians of the war is composed of the extracts from the letters and journals of those whose lives are recorded. Not only do

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these extracts present a vivid picture of almost all phases of the war, under almost all circumstances, but especially are they valuable for their revelations of combatant psychology.

W. G. Leland.

The Preparation of Calvin Coolidge: an Interpretation. By Robert A. Woods. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924, pp. iii, 288, $1.50.) The life of Theodore Roosevelt is one of the best examples of what is possible to the politician who is free. He was made free through the moderate wealth that came to him by inheritance. Calvin Coolidge is also free; free through the absence of wealth and, more significant, the absence of the need for it. In contrast with Roosevelt, who still had a future to be arranged for in 1901, Coolidge is additionally free, for at the moment of his elevation by the accident of Harding's death he had been set aside; and he knew it. A more adroit and a more compelling politician was to be sought to be the vice-presidential candidate with Harding in 1924, for the professional politicians knew with what difficulty the Republican party could carry that election at all. Many of the untoward facts that were concealed from the public until the days of Teapot Dome were known within the circle, and drew scars of age and worry on faces high and low.

Coolidge owed no man anything when death gave him his opportunity. The presidency was his, to make of it what he would; and the ease with which his Amherst crowd organized a victory for 1924 not only reveals the widespread distribution of political ability in America, but warrants the suspicion that this silent man possessed an intangible means of contact with his fellow-citizens. "I find the things I haven't uttered in my life haven't hurt me", he can say; and his passion for working machines instead of inventing them falls in with the temper of a public that has long listened to the advocates of political perpetual motion, and the rest.

Like any other life of Coolidge with a date imprint of 1924, this appears to be a campaign biography. It is over-interpretative and under-factual. It is panegyric throughout. But it has the advantage of being the work of an intelligent and honest man. Coolidge has said too little to give a Boswell a fair chance, but this analysis will have real usefulness for his ultimate biographer.

Frederic L. Paxson.

The Phillips Exeter Academy: a History. By Laurence M. Crosbie. (Exeter, N. H., the Academy, 1923, pp. xii, 347.) Mr. Crosbie's history of the Phillips-Exeter Academy is worthy of that famous school. While it will make its appeal primarily to the many graduates and friends of the academy, several chapters, particularly the early ones, will be of interest to a larger public. Especially valuable are the character sketches of

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"John Phillips: Puritan", the founder, and "Benjamin Abbot: Master", its second and most famous principal.

John Phillips, of the distinguished Massachusetts family, a graduate of Harvard and friend of Whitefield, John Wentworth, and Eleazar Wheelock, had many of the characteristic traits of the Puritans. He increased the considerable fortune brought him by his marriage to the widow Gilman by large profits in his country store at Exeter, by lending money at extraordinary rates of interest to his neighbors, and by land speculation. Frugal and even parsimonious ("he always blew out the candle during the long prayer"), he was nevertheless generous in his benefactions to Exeter, Andover, and Dartmouth.

The administration of Benjamin Abbot, the principal of the academy for fifty years from 1788 to 1838, might be called the heroic age of the school. It is doubtful if any other American teacher had so many pupils who became distinguished or any American school, except the Boston Latin School, so many famous alumni. Some of the more distinguished of Dr. Abbot's students were Daniel Webster, Lewis Cass, John A. Dix, Thomas W. Dorr, John P. Hale, Benjamin F. Butler, Fitz-John Porter, Edward Everett, Jared Sparks, John G. Palfrey, Richard Hildreth, and George Bancroft. Mr. Crosbie does not explain why Dr. Abbot's teaching so aroused the interest of his pupils in American history and public life.

In the later chapters, there is a very candid account of the troubled administrations of Principals Perkins and Fish and a fine appreciation of the reconstructive administration of Principal Amen. "The Lighter Side of School Life" receives serious attention; the history of the curriculum is briefly treated in the appendix.

ARCHIBALD FREEMAN.

Internal Improvements and State Debt in Ohio: an Essay in Economic History. By Ernest Ludlow Bogart, Ph.D. (New York and London, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1924, pp. x, 253, $2.50.) As the title indicates, this work takes the form of two monographs. As the debt of Ohio was almost entirely the result of an internal improvement policy, the two essays are closely connected. Together they constitute an appropriate continuation of the author's earlier volume on the *Financial History of Ohio* (1912). The second essay was originally published in the *Journal of Political Economy* for April, May, and June, 1911, and is now reprinted. Both are based upon an exhaustive study of the official records, and leave little more to be desired. Without wishing to seem to be an exacting critic it is the opinion of the reviewer that the social and economic effects of Ohio's internal improvement system deserve fuller treatment. But such a study would have taken the author into other sources, widely scattered, and outside of the bounds he had set for himself. The book is liberally supplied with statistical tables, which add

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greatly to its value. In several respects it should be of unusual value to students of history and to public officials. There is an interesting illustration of an early experience of a state in fixing rates, and a valuable account of the operation of the sinking-fund system to secure the systematic payment of a debt. Five times the provisions of the law for the creation of a sinking-fund, one of these in the constitution, were disregarded by the legislature. In only three years between 1873 and 1893 were these provisions observed. It is also noteworthy that while the state debt slowly declined after the Civil War that of the municipalities increased very rapidly. This means "that the constitutional prohibition of a state debt (for internal improvements) has not prevented the practice of mortgaging the future; it has simply changed its form and transferred the work of carrying out public improvements to agencies other than the state".

ELBERT J. BENTON.

The Falkland Islands. By V. F. Boyson, with Notes on the Natural History by Rupert Vallentin. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. xii, 414, 15 s.) It is in keeping with the rôle which the Falkland Islands have played in world politics that the first recorded landing upon their shores should have been made by the crew of an English privateer, commissioned to prey on French commerce and sailing in waters forbidden to her by the law of Spain; for it is as a bone of international contention or the scene of international conflict that these desolate, treeless, and wind-swept islands figure in the pages of history. Their first conspicuous appearance was in 1770, when the Spanish seizure of an insignificant British settlement on one of the smaller islands of the group brought Europe to the brink of a great war; their last was in 1914, when the destruction of Admiral von Spee's squadron put them on the front page of the newspaper. Between those dates, as Mr. Boyson shows, they occasionally appear in diplomatic correspondence, as when the Argentine Republic formally protested against the British claim to sovereignty over them, or when the American Secretary of State, Marcy, ventured to question Britain's right to them and was snubbed for his pains by Lord Clarendon, the British Foreign Secretary, who announced (the Monroe Doctrine to the contrary notwithstanding) that his Majesty's government would not discuss the matter and would continue to exercise rights of sovereignty "in and around the islands of the Falkland group".

One will gather from a reading of Mr. Boyson's historical account, which occupies somewhat less than half of his volume (the rest being devoted to the industries, natural features, and zoology of the islands), that the Falklands have been held in low esteem except when the national prestige of some claimant nation happened to be at stake. It would have been exceedingly difficult to make the internal history of this remote and

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unimportant colony very interesting, and Mr. Boyson, with the best of good-will, has not succeeded in doing so. He gives plenty of evidence of research in printed and manuscript sources, but little evidence of a sense of the salient in historical evolution. The narrative, especially in the later chapters, is a chronicle of events rather than a history. We are told much of the comings and goings of ships, of the doings of whalers and sealers, of storms and wrecks, but we gain little knowledge of the development of a community.

ROBERT LIVINGSTON SCHUYLER.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

By arrangement in the nature of exchange between the American Historical Association and the English Historical Association one hundred copies of two of the latter's pamphlets are placed at the service of members of the former body, namely, a pamphlet on *The Congress of Vienna, 1814–1815, and the Conference of Paris, 1919*, prepared by Professors C. K. Webster and H. W. V. Temperley, and one on *Historical Novels* by Professor Sir Charles Firth. These are now at the office of this journal, and will be sent, individually, to any members of the Association who may request them by letter addressed to J. F. Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building.

THE ENDOWMENT FUND

The Association has resolved upon a determined effort to increase its endowment, now standing at about $42,000, by at least $200,000, perhaps $400,000, of additional funds. No one who is familiar with the affairs of the Association doubts the need of such an increased endowment. The annual dues of members, in ordinary years, defray the expenses of the office of secretary and treasurer and of those committees that can properly be classed as committees of management—Executive Council, committees on nominations, programme, local arrangements, and the like—and the cost of printing and issuing this journal. But for anything beyond expenses of maintenance and of machinery, that is to say, for any of those expenditures toward the increase of knowledge (outside the publication of the *Review*) which may rightly be thought the chief function of such a society, it is dependent on the income from the Endowment Fund, an income which last year amounted to $2474.

The result is, first, that some valuable lines of activity to which the Association has long been committed receive a most meagre support, are crippled for want of funds, and secondly, that the Association is unable to enter upon several other activities which it distinctly ought to undertake. The Historical Manuscripts Commission and the Public Archives Commission, which in past times have contributed to the *Annual Reports* the sections that have given them most distinction and usefulness, have received almost no appropriations since the war. Several other committees, which could do work of great value for history if given a chance, can receive only the most insufficient support.

Of new tasks, suffering to be undertaken, it would not be difficult to make a large list. An indefinite amount of work in the exploitation of foreign archives for American history remains to be done. The proposed

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bibliography of travels in the United States, the bibliography of modern English history, taken up in co-operation with British scholars, photostatic and other reproduction of manuscript or rare materials—among several researches that could be named—all call for money. Much additional publication, outside the *Annual Reports,* especially publication of original material and of instruments of historical research, could also be undertaken if there were means.

At the recent meeting in Richmond, the Committee on the Endowment was reorganized. Professor Evarts B. Greene, of Columbia University, is now its chairman, and Professor Henry M. Wriston, of Wesleyan University, its executive secretary. Plans have been taken up with energy, but will be framed with deliberate care and with the fixed intention of success. The sum of $200,000 is not an excessive one to expect. More than one local historical society already has, quite apart from its buildings and books, a larger endowment than that at which the Association is aiming. Interest in American history is rising. It is sure to increase throughout the period of sesquicentennial celebrations we are now approaching. Many men of wealth will take pleasure in helping this cause. It will, however, be natural for them first to inquire what the members of the Association itself have done for its promotion. Therefore the committee has resolved to make its first appeal to the existing membership. This will be done systematically. In each locality where there are several members, one of them will be asked, and surely will consent, to make a personal canvass of the members. It is earnestly hoped that each member will give all that he reasonably can. Provision will be made for spreading the gift in installments over several years. By a vote of the executive council, any member who contributes an aggregate sum of one hundred dollars within a period of five years, in addition to his annual dues, is to become a life member. Members can also help by securing additional members, life or annual.

The striking manner in which members, a few years ago, responded to the treasurer's suggestion that, to meet post-war difficulties, an additional dollar or two might be sent when remitting annual dues (two-thirds of the members thus responded) shows a great fund of good-will toward the Association on the part of its members. There is the clearest evidence of their cordial interest in the work which it is trying to do. It is earnestly hoped, and indeed it is firmly believed, that the members, each according to his or her means, will make a cordial and impressive response to whatever appeal comes to them on behalf of the committee.

The names of the committee, besides those of Professors Greene and Wriston, are as follows: Charles M. Andrews, John S. Bassett, Albert J. Beveridge, Guy S. Ford, Worthington C. Ford, Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson, H. Barrett Learned, Stewart L. Mims, Charles Moore, William A. Morris, Dana C. Munro, Otto L. Schmidt.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERSONAL

Richard A. Rice, who from 1890 to 1911 was successively professor of history and of the history of art and civilization in Williams College, and since 1912 had been chief of the Division of Prints in the Library of Congress, died in Washington on February 6, at the age of seventy-eight. He was one of the forty-one original members of the American Historical Association, of whom but nine are now left.

Sir James Ramsay of Bamff, Bart., F.B.A., died on February 17, at the age of ninety-two. His solid and scholarly works on *Lancaster and York* (1892), *The Foundations of England* (1898), *The Angevin Empire* (1903), *The Dawn of the Constitution* (1908), and *The Genesis of Lancaster* (1913), cover the whole field of English medieval history with a narrative buttressed everywhere by references and invaluable to the student.

Professor Laurence B. Packard of the University of Rochester has accepted election as a professor of history in Amherst College, his service there to begin next September.

In the summer session of Columbia University lectures will be given by Professors Nathaniel Schmidt, of Cornell University, D. C. Munro, of Princeton, L. M. Larson, of Illinois, Witt Bowden, of Pennsylvania, J. S. Bassett, of Smith, I. J. Cox, of Northwestern, and B. B. Kendrick, of the North Carolina College for Women.

Dr. Arthur P. Whitaker, spending the present year in the Archives of the Indies, at Seville, is preparing for publication a study of frontier and diplomatic conflict between Spain and the United States in the period 1783–1795.

Frederick J. Manning of Yale University has been appointed assistant professor of history in Swarthmore College and will begin service there next September.

Professor Edward Raymond Turner, of Yale University, has accepted election as professor of English history in the Johns Hopkins University; Professor John M. Vincent has retired.

Dr. Tyler Dennett has been made editor of publications in the Department of State at Washington. Dr. Joseph V. Fuller, of the University of Wisconsin, will be associated with him in the historical work connected with the series *Foreign Relations*.

Professor Bernadotte E. Schmitt, of the University of Chicago, sailed for Europe in March, to spend several months of study in the Balkans and the succession states. He will return in July and will conduct a "round table" at the Institute of Politics at Williamstown.

Professor Bernard Faÿ, of the University of Clermont-Ferrand, will be a member of the summer faculty of Northwestern University this year,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

giving a course on French civilization at the time of the French Revolution.

Professor Ulrich B. Phillips of the University of Michigan will teach in the summer session of Harvard University this year.

Mr. C. L. Benson has been appointed assistant professor of European history in the University of Arkansas.

Professor Waldemar Westergaard of Pomona College has been elected professor of European history in the University of California, Southern Branch.

GENERAL

It ought to be made known to mature scholars, well advanced in historical studies, that in May Amherst College will make appointments for the academic years 1925–1927, and for the years 1926–1928, respectively, to two memorial fellowships, each of $2000 per annum, for the study of human relationships to existing social, economic, and political institutions. Historical studies are included in the scope of the award. Correspondence should be addressed to Mr. Paul H. Douglas, at Amherst College. A more recent institution is that of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, established by ex-Senator and Mrs. Simon Guggenheim for the promotion of advanced study and research in any field of knowledge, by the grant of fellowships, mostly for advanced study abroad, to men or women who have already shown marked ability in their particular subject, perhaps most commonly persons between twenty-five and thirty-five years of age, including young professors on sabbatical leave. Only those candidates will be appointed who have embarked upon some important piece of work, and who show exceptional aptitude for research. The fellowships, about $2500 in value, and ultimately forty or fifty in number, will be first awarded for the academic year 1926–1927. Correspondence should be addressed to Mr. Henry Allen Moe, Secretary, 120 Broadway, New York.

Professor J. T. Shotwell contributes to the January number of the *Historical Outlook* an article on Mechanism and Culture, and Professor Ezra Bowen one entitled Dynastic Delaware. In the February number are found an article on European Political Boundaries, by S. C. Gilfillan; and an account of the Richmond meeting of the American Historical Association, by Dr. R. H. Shryock. The March number contains an Interpretation of German History, by Professor C. C. Eckhardt, and a pungent paper by Dean A. K. Heckel, of the University of Missouri, on Pure History and Patriotism.

The January number of *History* has papers by Mrs. C. S. B. Buckland on *Saint Joan*; by Miss Cecilia M. Ady on Italian Influences on English History during the Period of the Renaissance; and by Professor H. L. Hoskins, of Tufts College, on the Overland Route to India in the Eighteenth Century.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Articles in the January *Journal of Negro History* are: Amherstburg, Terminus of the Underground Railroad, by Fred Landon, and a Carpet-Bagger in South Carolina, by Louis F. Post. The Leclerc Instructions are printed, with an introduction by Carl L. Lokke; and an account of the proceedings of the ninth annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Richmond, September 29–30, 1924.

The contents of the January number of the *Catholic Historical Review* include articles on Religious Tolerance during the Early Part of the Reign of Constantine the Great, by Dr. John R. Knipfing, the Blessed Cardinal Bellarmine's Defense of Popular Government in the Sixteenth Century, by Rev. John C. Rager, the Formula of Baptism in the Early Church, by Rev. Dr. Leo F. Miller, and the Belief in the Continuity of the Roman Empire among the Franks of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries, by Rev. Dr. Herman Fischer. There are briefer accounts of the Industrial Position of Woman in the Middle Ages, by Sister M. Pia, and of the Old Catholic Chapel and Graveyard near Aquia, Stafford County, Va., by Margaret B. Downing.

In the five volumes of the *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle* (Rome, Tipografia del Senato), published a few months ago in honor of Cardinal Ehrle, among the 81 learned contributions, from scholars of fourteen different countries, the following may be noted as of especial interest to students of history: Leopold Wenger (Munich), "Hausgewalt und Staatsgewalt im Römischen Altertum"; Paul Kehr (Berlin), "Papst Gregor VIII. als Ordensgründer"; Leonhard Lemmens, O.F.M. (Rome), "Die Schriften des Br. Leo von Assisi"; Joseph Fischer, S.J. (Feldkirch), "War der erste Apostel 'der Indischen Inseln' (der Neuen Welt) ein Sohn des Hl. Benediktus oder des Hl. Franziskus"; M. Anesaki (Tokio), "Some Unrecorded Japanese Martyrdoms of the Catholic Church in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century" (from documents in Nagasaki); Bruno Katterbach, O.F.M. (Rome), and W. M. Peitz, S.J. (Feldkirch), "Die Unterschriften der Päpste und Kardinäle in den Bullae Majores vom 11. bis 14. Jahrhundert"; C. H. Haskins (Cambridge), "Two Roman Formularies in Philadelphia" (in the library of the late H. C. Lea—that which he published in 1892 and another, XIII. cent.); and Emil Göller (Freiburg i. Br.), "Untersuchungen über das Inventar des Finanzarchivs der Renaissancepäpste, 1447–1521".

The Institute of International Education issues a *Syllabus on International Relations,* by Professor Parker T. Moon, of Columbia University, partly historical in character, systematic, comprehensive, and well adapted to promote the study of political, historical, and economic aspects of international relations.

A valuable guide to the whole technique of modern treaty-formation and interpretation is to be found in the work of Ludwig Bittner, vice-director of the State Archives at Vienna, *Die Lehre von den Völkerrecht-*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lichen Vertragsurkunden (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1924, pp. xiv, 316).

Master Minds in Medicine, by Dr. John C. Hemmeter, of Baltimore, soon to be published by the *Medical Life* Press, of New York, comprises a studious discussion of the methods and content of medical historiography and a series of biographical essays on the chief leaders in medical progress.

The firm of G. Van Oest and Co., of Brussels and Paris, whose specialty is the publication of elaborately illustrated books on the history of art, announces three volumes *de luxe* on the *Histoire du Portrait en France au XVI^e Siècle,* by Dr. Louis Dimier, the first (to 1500) of three volumes of an *Histoire de la Gravure dans les Anciens Pays-Bas et dans les Provinces Belges,* by A. J. J. Delen, of the Plantin-Moretus Museum, and *La Miniature Française du XIII^e au XV^e Siècle,* by Henry Martin, of the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. S. Latourette, *The Study of the History of Missions* (International Review of Missions, January); Lt.-Col. E. C. Anstey, *The Study of Military History* (Army Quarterly, January).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General reviews: A. Vincent, *Chronique d'Histoire Orientale* [incl. modern] (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); A. M. Woodward, *Archaeological Discovery in Greece in 1922–1924* (Journal of Hellenic Studies, XLIV. 2); M. A. Levi, *La Caduta della Repubblica Romana* (Rivista Storica Italiana, July).

Vol. III. in E. Cavaignac's series, *Histoire du Monde,* has been published under the title *Indo-Européens et Indo-Iraniens: l'Inde jusqu'à vers 300 av. J. C.,* by L. de la Vallée-Poussin, professor in the University of Ghent (Paris, Boccard, 1924, pp. 346).

Piracy in the Mediterranean from Homeric times down to the pacification of the seas under the Roman Empire is treated with care and with competent scholarship in Henry A. Ormerod's *Piracy in the Ancient World* (Liverpool, University Press).

A new study of *L'Empire Romain* by Professor Léon Homo of Lyons is announced as embodying the most recent contributions of archaeology and epigraphy to that subject (Paris, Payot, 1925, pp. 400).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: I. L. Gordon, *Digging through the Ages* [University of Pennsylvania excavations at Beisan, Beth-Shan, Scythopolis] (Atlantic Monthly, February); A. Merlin, *La Civilisation Égéenne* (Journal des Savants, September); M. Cary, *Greek Trade Routes* (Journal of Hellenic Studies, XLIV. 2); W. W. Tarn, *The Political Standing of Delos* (*ibid.*); A. Körte, *Die Attische Demokratie*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

des 4. Jahrhunderts (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXII. 2–3); W. Menzies, *Pliny and the Roman Bar under Trajan* (Juridical Review, September).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

The fourth volume of Mgr. O. Bardenhewer's *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1924, pp. x, 673) treats, in the same careful and competent manner as its predecessors, the Greek and Latin ecclesiastical writings of the fifth century, and the Syriac writings of both the fourth and fifth.

The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge will shortly publish a volume of *Select Passages illustrating Mithraism*, by Dr. A. S. Geden; the Cambridge University Press publishes *The Religion of the Manichees*, the Donnellan Lectures for 1924, by Professor F. C. Burkitt, who has made it a special object to utilize the remarkable recent discoveries of original Manichaean literature from central Asia.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Hans von Soden, *Die Anfänge des Christentums in der Darstellung Eduard Meyers* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLIII. 2); Louis Rougier, *L'Accord de la Raison et de la Foi chez les Pères de l'Église* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, XXXVIII.).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Travellers and Travelling in the Middle Ages, by Everard L. Guilford, is no. 38 of the S. P. C. K. series of *Texts for Students*.

A thorough study of the Hildebrandine ecclesiastical reform is being undertaken by Augustin Fliche under the title *La Réforme Grégorienne*. The first volume, *La Formation des Idées Grégoriennes*, appears as a fascicle of the *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense* (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. x, 423).

The Very Rev. Dom Bede Jarrett, provincial of the Dominicans in England, has produced a small but readable book on the *Life of Saint Dominic* (London, Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 1924, pp. xi, 180).

In a Breslau series of monographs in church history and historical theology, Dr. Berthold Altaner brings out a learned history of Dominican missions in the thirteenth century, both in the Orient and in northeastern Europe, *Die Dominikanermissionen des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Halberschwerdt, 1924, pp. 250).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Walther Holtzmann, *Studien zur Orientpolitik des Reformpapsttums und zur Entstehung des 1. Kreuzzuges* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXII. 2–3).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

A study in the domain of political theory by the veteran Friedrich Meinecke is *Die Idee der Staatsräson in der Neueren Geschichte* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1924, pp. 546).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the little series called *The World's Manuals* R. B. Mowat publishes a useful text of 96 pages on *The European States System: a Study of International Relations* (Oxford University Press).

A commission appointed by the educational ministry of Prussia has been for some time preparing a general bibliography of incunabula. Of the twelve volumes, the first, *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* (Leipzig, K. W. Hiersemann), appears this month. The work when completed will describe 38,000 separate items, where Hain recorded but 16,000. The work has been in progress since 1904, at first under the charge of Dr. Konrad Haebler, lately under the general editorship of Professor Erich von Rath.

A statesman of international importance at the beginning of the sixteenth century is commemorated by Professor Albert Büchi, of the University of Fribourg, in *Kardinal Matthäus Schiner als Staatsmann und Kirchenfürst,* of which the first volume, down to 1514, has appeared (Zürich, Seldwyla). His record of the Bishop of Sion is of course based largely on his own edition of Schiner's correspondence in the *Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte* (Basel, 1920).

In the Carnegie Endowment's series of *Classics of International Law* it has now brought out Bynkershoek's *De Dominio Dissertatio,* presenting a brief introduction by Dr. James Brown Scott, a translation by Professor R. V. D. Magoffin, and a photographic reproduction of the second edition, that of 1744.

Jonathan Cape, of London, has in preparation a new work by H. W. V. Temperley, entitled *The Diary of Princess Lieven,* in which the diary, and other papers hitherto unpublished, some of them from the Russian archives, are made the centre of a personal and social study of her period and her political contemporaries.

The *Slavonic Review* for December publishes a series of hitherto unprinted documents illustrating Russo-British relations during the Eastern Crisis of 1875, selected by Professor R. W. Seton-Watson from the archives of the Russian embassy in London.

La Turquie, l'Allemagne, et l'Europe depuis le Traité de Berlin jusqu'à la Guerre Mondiale (Paris, Berger, 1924, pp. 311) is from the pen of General M. Moukhtar Pasha, former ambassador of Turkey at Berlin.

A detailed study of the Triple Alliance, making use of the recently published material from the Austrian and German archives, is being undertaken by a Swedish scholar, Helge Granfelt, under the title *Das Dreibundsystem, 1879–1916.* The first volume, *Vom Zweibund bis zum Sturze Bismarcks,* has now appeared (Stockholm, privately printed, 1924, pp. xxii, 416).

A *Supplement* in two volumes to the *New International Encylopaedia* (New York, Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1925, pp. 1502), prepared by the

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

late Dr. Frank M. Colby, is the last complete revision of the *Encyclopaedia* itself begun in 1914; the present supplement covers the ten years following, dealing adequately with the war, showing in every section how its effects have ramified through all parts and aspects of the world, and elsewhere bringing up to the present time the various subjects treated in the articles of a cyclopaedia. The historical articles have been to a considerable extent prepared by the members of the faculty of Columbia University.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Werner Kaegi, *Hutten und Erasmus*, I., II. (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXII. 2–3); J. Dontenville, *Les Relations Franco-Suisses* (Nouvelle Revue, December 1); René de Weck, *Les Relations Diplomatiques entre la France et la Suisse jusqu'au Commencement du Dix-Huitième Siècle* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXVIII. 4); Maj. E. W. H. Fyers, *The Story of the Machine Vessels* (Mariner's Mirror, January); C. van Vollenhoven, *Grotius and the Study of Law* (American Journal of International Law, January); J. S. Reeves, *The First Edition of Grotius de Jure Belli ac Pacis, 1625* (*ibid.*); C. G. Picavet, *État de Paix et État de Guerre au Temps de Louis XIV.* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXVIII. 4); H. Dehérain, *La Rupture du Gouvernement Ottoman avec la France en l'An VI.* (*ibid.*, XXXIX. 1); H. Temperley, *French Designs on Spanish America in 1820–1825* (English Historical Review, January); Hajo Holborn, *Die Europäische Politik zu Beginn der Siebziger Jahre* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, November); Hugo Preller, *Zur Entstehung und Struktur des Russisch-Französischen Zweibundes von 1890–1894* (*ibid.*); W. Mommsen, *Die Elsass-Lothringische Frage von 1897–1904* (*ibid.*, December); Jehan de Witte, *La Correspondance entre Guillaume II. et Nicolas II.* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXIX. 1); Comte de Sainte-Aulaire, *Souvenirs de mon Ambassade à Vienne*, V. (Revue de Paris, December 15).

THE WORLD WAR

A very well made and convenient guide to the literature, in various tongues, on the origins of the war is the small book, *Die Kriegsschuldfrage* (Leipzig, Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler, 1925, pp. 176), listing nearly 2000 titles.

Asserted to be of capital importance for the question of responsibility for the World War, Ernest Judet's *Georges Louis* (Paris, Rieder, 1925, pp. 320) is based on official despatches and private letters to and from the former French ambassador to Russia, recalled in disfavor February, 1913.

Lt.-Gen. De Selliers de Moranville, chief of staff of the Belgian army at the outbreak of the war, furnishes in *Du Haut de la Tour de Babel* (Paris, Berger, 1924, pp. 238) a commentary on war preparations and the strategical situation in Belgium in 1914.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Case for the Central Powers: an Impeachment of the Versailles Verdict, published in an English translation by Allen and Unwin, London, is a volume prepared by Count Max Montgelas, one of the editors of diplomatic documents for the German Republic, in order to present in convenient form the evidences for the German point of view on the *Schuldfrage.*

The second volume of the *Official History of the War on the Western Front,* by Brig.-Gen. J. E. Edmonds, has just been published (London, Macmillan). It completes the narrative down to the close of the first battle of Ypres, October–November, 1914.

Military historians will undoubtedly find material of great value in the official history compiled by the Historical Service of the French General Staff under the title *Les Armées Françaises dans la Grande Guerre; Précis d'Ensemble des Opérations des Armées Françaises sur les Différents Fronts.* Tome I., vol. I., now published, includes *La Guerre de Mouvement; les Préliminaires, la Bataille des Frontières,* giving the operations prior to Aug. 24, 1914 (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1925). The edition is limited to 500 copies.

The greater part of the French cavalry in 1914 was organized into a corps under the command of General Conneau. This corps, as a mounted body, did excellent service in Lorraine, on the Marne, and as a liaison force with the British army; it was then dismounted and served in the trenches at various points. The detailed history of its manoeuvres is told in a pamphlet compiled under the direction of General Conneau on the basis of the archives in the Ministry of War. It is entitled *Historique des Corps de Cavalerie commandés par le Général Conneau du 14 Août 1914 au 2 Mars 1917* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1924, pp. 154).

The first volume of the German official war history of land operations, *Der Weltkrieg, 1914 bis 1918,* I. *Die Grenzschlachten im Westen* (Berlin, Mittler), extends no further than August 27, 1914.

A group of Italian studies on military operations of the World War is furnished by the following: A. Alberti, *Esame di Alcune Manovre Accerchianti* [this also contains an essay on Bazaine's action at Metz in 1870] (Rome, Stabilimento Poligrafico, 1924); A. Alberti, *L'Azione Militare Italiana nella Guerra Mondiale* (Rome, Pinnario, 1924); C. Assum, *La Prima Difesa del Gruppa, 13–26 Novembre 1917* (Turin, Gobetti, 1924).

Material for the history of financial negotiations arising from the Great War is found in the recollections of the former French finance minister, L. L. Klotz, *De la Guerre à la Paix: Souvenirs et Documents* (Paris, Payot, 1924, pp. 254).

Recent additions to the volumes of the *Economic and Social History of the World War* edited by Professor Shotwell are, in the French series,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henri Hauser's *Le Problème du Régionalisme* (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. xii, 176) and Albert Aftalion's *L'Industrie Textile en France pendant la Guerre* (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. xii, 264); in the Belgian series, Albert Henry's *Le Ravitaillement de la Belgique pendant l'Occupation Allemande* (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. 210).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Wilhelm Groener, *Das Kriegsgeschichtliche Werk des Reichsarchivs* (Preussische Jahrbücher, January); R. W. Seton-Watson, *The Murder at Sarajevo* (Foreign Affairs, April); Albert Mousset, *L'Attentat de Sarajevo, d'après des Documents Inédits* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXIX. 1); Claude Farrère and Paul Chack, *Un Combat et une Bataille*: I., *Le Combat de Coronel*; II., concl., *La Bataille des Falkland* (Revue de Paris, December 15, January 1, 15).

GREAT BRITAIN

The Cambridge University Press announces *The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I.*, texts, with translations and introductory notes by Miss A. J. Robertson; *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism*, by A. F. Scott Pearson; and *Charles Napier: a Biography*, by Dr. T. Rice Holmes.

The latest of the *University of London Intermediate Source Books of History* is *England under the Early Tudors*, by C. H. Williams.

In a Swedish monograph published in English, *The Fall of the Monasteries and the Social Changes in England leading up to the Great Revolution* (Lund, University, 1924, pp. 150), Dr. S. B. Liljegren presents a catalogue of monastic estates and their grantees from 1536 to 1546 and argues the influence of this redistribution of property in causing the political revolutions of the seventeenth century.

No. 37 of *Texts for Students* is entitled *Traders in East and West*, being some aspects of trade in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, illustrated from the sources, by Florence L. Bowman and Esther J. Roper (London, Sheldon Press, 93 pp.). The documents concern the founding of the East India Company, shipping, factories in India, eastern trade, tea and coffee, the Hudson's Bay Company, the trade in slaves, tobacco trade, the Royal Exchange, and the Bank of England.

Professor Wallace Notestein delivered the annual Raleigh lecture before the British Academy October 2, 1924, on the subject, "The Winning of the Initiative by the House of Commons".

Lt.-Col. the Hon. Benjamin Bathurst publishes from family archives, under the title, *Letters of Two Queens* (*Queen Mary II. and Queen Anne*), the letters which the two young daughters of James Duke of York wrote to the editor's ancestress, Frances Apsley, for whom they had a romantic attachment. The book casts much light on their early development.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Evan Charteris, K. C., has prepared from original materials in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, the French Foreign Office, Windsor Castle, etc., *William Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, and the Seven Years' War* (London, Hutchinson).

Under the title *A Prime Minister and his Son* (London, John Murray), the Hon. Mrs. Edward Stuart-Wortley publishes a volume of correspondence of the third Earl of Bute and General Sir Charles Stuart, compiled from unpublished letters and papers at Highcliffe Castle, illustrating both political and military history.

The English Jacobins from 1789 to 1802, by Robert Birley, of Balliol College (Oxford University Press, pp. 52), is the Gladstone Memorial Prize Essay for 1924.

Professor E. D. Adams, of Stanford University, expects to bring out this spring two volumes on *Great Britain and the American Civil War* (Longmans), the fruit of thorough investigation.

Vol. I. of Sir Sidney Lee's *King Edward VII.: a Biography,* prepared at the request of King George, was published early in March and extends to the king's accession. The second and completing volume, covering the king's reign, will, it is hoped, be ready before the end of 1925.

Mr. John Buchan's *Lord Minto: a Memoir* (London, Nelson) is an admirably told story of one who in 1898–1910 was successively governor general of Canada and viceroy of India, and in many ways a model public servant in those two widely different employments.

The English Constitution in Transition, 1910–1924 (Clarendon Press, pp. 40), by Sir John A. R. Marriott, M. P., is intended as a supplement to the second edition of his *English Political Institutions* (1910–1913), inserted in a third edition in order to bring it up to date, but obtainable separately. It reviews in a conservative spirit the various constitutional changes in the executive, Parliament, and the Empire during the years indicated.

Mr. George Glasgow's *MacDonald as Diplomatist* (London, Jonathan Cape, pp. 232) is a survey of the foreign policy of the first Labor government in Great Britain, consisting mainly of articles which the author has contributed to the *Contemporary Review,* and introduced by a preface from Dr. G. P. Gooch, who commends him as always speaking "the language of good sense and good-will".

Mr. T. P. Ellis, late principal legal adviser to the Punjab government, has completed a two-volume work on *Welsh Tribal Law and Custom in the Middle Ages.* Subjects dealt with are the social structure, the land, renders and services, the law of persons, of civil obligations, of crimes and torts, the courts and judiciary, the law of distress, of boundaries, and of procedure. A glossary of Welsh terms and maps are included. The Oxford University Press will publish the book by subscription at the price

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of three guineas provided that adequate support is given. The edition will be limited and the price raised on publication.

The *Scottish Historical Review* has articles on the Prince of Scotland (as title of the son and heir of the reigning king) by J. H. Stevenson, K. C.; on the English and Scottish Cotton Industries and their Interrelations, by Miss G. M. Mitchell; and on Sixteenth-Century Schemes for the Plantation of Ulster, by Robert Dunlop.

Dr. G. P. Insh has followed his book on *Scottish Colonial Schemes, 1620–1686,* reviewed in vol. XXVIII. of this journal, p. 305, with a volume of papers relating to *The Ships and Voyages of the Company of Scotland trading to Africa and the Indies, 1696–1707* (Edinburgh, T. and A. Constable).

British government publication: *Calendar of the Fine Rolls,* Edward III., 1368–1377.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. B. Adams, *The Origin of the Common Law* (Yale Law Journal, December); E. J. White, *William the Conqueror and English Law* (American Law Review, November–December); N. Neilson, *Custom and the Common Law in Kent* (Harvard Law Review, February); W. Senior, *England and the Mediæval Empire* (Law Quarterly Review, October); Henri Sée, *L'Évolution du Régime Agraire en Angleterre, depuis la Fin du Moyen Age* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, XXXVIII.); R. C. Wilton, *The Pilgrimage of Grace* (Dublin Review, January–March); R. G. Usher, *The Institutional History of the House of Commons, 1547–1641* (Washington University Studies, XI. 2); E. A. Beller, *The Negotiations of Sir Stephen Le Sieur, 1584–1613* (English Historical Review, January); Kingsley Martin, *The Development of British Imperialism* (Economica, November); R. P. Bieber, *The British Plantation Councils of 1670–1674* (English Historical Review, January); John Fletcher, *John Lingard, D.D., F. R. S., 1771–1851* (Dublin Review, January–March); W. T. Morgan, *Labor's Attempt to govern Britain* (Journal of Political Economy, February).

IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see p. 698; for India, see p. 680.)

Professor Eric A. Walker's volume on *Lord de Villiers and his Times: South Africa, 1842–1914* (London, Constable) treats with sympathy and with full and competent knowledge the life of one who was chief justice of the Cape Colony from 1873 to the end of his life, and also had close relations to all the political events of the period, as a strong supporter of the British Empire.

Mr. C. E. W. Bean's *Official History of Australia in the War,* vol. II. (Sydney, Angus and Robertson), presents the story of Anzac from May 4, 1915, to the evacuation of the Gallipoli peninsula.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the *Victorian Historical Magazine* for November there is a brief statement of the Origin of the Historical Society of Victoria, by A. W. Grieg, Some Notes on John Batman's Journal of his Visit to Port Phillip in May and June, 1835, by the same author, a continuation of Charles Daley's paper on Baron Sir Ferdinand von Mueller, K. C. M. G., M.D., F. R. S., Botanist, Explorer, and Geographer, and a study of Dendy's Special Survey (of Brighton) by Professor Ernest Scott.

FRANCE

Champion has announced the revival of Lorenz and Jordell's *Catalogue Général de la Librairie Française,* which has been interrupted for a number of years. The last fascicle of vol. XXVIII. has been published and a new series begun in November under the direction of M. Henri Stein. The first volume (vol. XXIX.) will cover the period from 1919 to 1921.

The director of the Archives Nationales, M. Charles V. Langlois, has begun preparation for printing a *Répertoire Critique des Anciens Inventaires d'Archives Françaises antérieurs à l'Ancien Régime,* sure to be of service to many students.

Michel Prévost has prepared an *Inventaire Sommaire des Pièces Manuscrites contenues dans la Collection Morel de Thoisy au Département des Imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, Leroux, 1924, pp. xxi, 584). The documents concern historical, ecclesiastical, and especially legal matters; a few date from the Middle Ages and the sixteenth century, but many more from the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

In the series *Classiques Français du Moyen Age,* no. 40 is Robert de Clari's account of *La Conquête de Constantinople,* edited by Philippe Lauer (Paris, Champion, 1925, pp. xvi, 132).

Edmond Perrin's *Catalogue des Chartes de Franchises de la Lorraine antérieures à 1350* (reprinted from the *Annuaire de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de la Lorraine,* vol. XXXIII., pp. 269–413, Metz, Even, 1924) contains 252 numbers with résumés; it is said to be a model for publications of this type.

M. Lucien Romier's *Catholiques et Huguenots à la Cour de Charles IX.* (Paris, Perrin, 1924, pp. 355) is a very important study, based almost entirely on original authorities, and penetrating and just.

The Marquis d'Argenson continues to select from the family archives portions of the *Correspondance du Comte d'Argenson, Ministre de la Guerre.* This time it is *Lettres des Maréchaux de France,* vol. I. (Paris, Messein, 1924, pp. 317); those of Marshals Belle-Isle, Saxe, and Lowendal are included.

The historian will rightly attach great importance to a full publication of the correspondence of Rousseau. The late Théophile Dufour, chief

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

librarian of the Public Library of Geneva, labored more than fifty years to collect, from innumerable sources, all the letters of that great historical figure, of whose correspondence only a small part, it appears, had ever been published before. Edited for M. Dufour's executors by P. P. Plan, the definitive collection, *Correspondance Générale de J. J. Rousseau* (Paris, Armand Colin), will embrace more than three thousand of Rousseau's letters and more than a thousand from his correspondents, with much commentary by Dufour. Of the twenty volumes of the series, the first two have now been published, extending from 1728 to 1756.

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library for January contains a bibliographical list of editions of Beaumarchais available for study in New York City.

Students of the period will welcome the ninth series of Professor A. Aulard's *Études et Leçons sur la Révolution Française* (Paris, Alcan, 1924, pp. 211).

Recent works in the Revolutionary and Napoleonic period are Fernand Baldensperger's *Le Mouvement des Idées dans l'Émigration Française, 1789–1815* (Paris, Plon, 1925, 2 vols.) and Geoffroy de Grandmaison's *L'Espagne et Napoléon,* vol. II., *1809–1811* (Paris, Plon, 1925, pp. xii, 372).

Details of unusual interest concerning the daily life of a French refugee at the time of the Revolution are to be found in the *Souvenirs Autobiographiques d'un Émigré, 1790–1800,* by the Baron de Vitrolles, edited by Eugène Forgues (Paris, Paul, 1924, pp. xxix, 255).

La Grande Fuite de Décembre 1793 et la Situation Politique et Religieuse du Bas-Rhin de 1794 à 1799 is the last work by the late distinguished Alsatian scholar, Rodolphe Reuss (Strasbourg, Istra, pp. 350).

Vol. IV. of the *Histoire Financière de la France depuis 1715,* by Marcel Marion, professor in the Collège de France, covers the years 1797–1818 (Paris, Rousseau, 1925, pp. 435).

Notice is directed to the fact that the *Revue des Études Napoléoniennes* now bears the name *Napoléon*; it continues to be published bimonthly.

An important addition to the history of the Parisian press is furnished by *Le Journal des Débats, 1814–1914* (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. xix, 262), a volume prepared by Alfred Pereire and originally intended to commemorate the centenary of that journal.

Plon announces vol. I. of *Le Second Empire vu par un Diplomat Belge, Baron Beyens* (Paris, 1924, pp. 485).

A critical edition of the *Procès-verbaux de la Commune de 1871,* by Georges Bourgin and Gabriel Henriot, will throw light on that troubled period. Vol. I., now published, covers March–April, 1871 (Paris, Leroux, 1924, pp. 608).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Mgr. L. Duchesne, *L'Église dans la Gaule Franque* (Revue des Deux Mondes, November 15); S. R. Packard, *The Judicial Organization of Normandy, 1189–1204* (Law Quarterly Review, October); Ch. Petit-Dutaillis, *Le Déshéritement de Jean sans Terre et le Meurtre d'Arthur de Bretagne,* concl. (Revue Historique, January); F. C. Palm, *Mercantilism as a Factor in Richelieu's Policy of National Interests* (American Political Science Review, December); G. Michon, *Les Séances des 8 et 9 Thermidor au Club des Jacobins* (Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française, November); G. Grosjean, *République et Saint-Siège,* I., *1793*; II., *1848* (Revue des Deux Mondes, November 1, 15); F. Charles-Roux, *La Politique Musulmane de Bonaparte* (Napoléon, January); Lanzac de Laborie, *L'Instruction Secondaire sous Napoléon* (Revue de Paris, November 15); Duc de Broglie, *Mémoires, 1825–1870,* I., II. (Revue des Deux Mondes, December 15, January 1); Albert Guérard, *Mesocracy in France: the Dictatorship of the Middle Class* (Scribner's Magazine, January); *id., In the Realm of King Log: the Presidency of the French Republic* (*ibid.,* February); G. Lacour-Gayet, *L'Impératrice Eugénie avant son Règne* (Revue de Paris, December 15); C. Pagani, *Felice Orsini, Eugenia di Montijo, e Napoleone III.* (Nuova Antologia).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General review: Friedrich Schneider, *Italienischer Literaturbericht* [Italian works on Italian history, 1922–1923] (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXI. 1).

In the series of *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia,* published in Rome by the Istituto Storico Italiano, Professor Luigi Schiaparelli continues his edition of the documents of the early kings by a volume of *I Diplomi di Ugo e di Lotario, di Berengario II. e di Adalbert.*

There has now appeared the fourth and last volume of U. Dallari's laborious and valuable work, *I Rotuli dei Lettori Legisti e Artisti dello Studio Bolognese dal 1384 al 1799* (Bologna, Deput. di St. Patr., 1924, pp. viii, 236, fol.).

A volume covering comprehensively the history of the Italian Risorgimento, from 1814 to 1918, by Professor Arrigo Solmi of Pavia, was published in London in January by Messrs. Ernest Benn, under the title *The Making of Modern Italy,* edited with an introduction by Arundell del Re, Taylorian lecturer in Italian at Oxford.

Those whose fate it is to pursue historical investigations in the Archives of Simancas will find great utility in the little manual, *Archivo General de Simancas: Guía del Investigador* (Valladolid, Casa Social Católica, 1923, pp. 205), with which the present director, Don Mariano Alcocer Martínez, has replaced Díaz Sánchez and supplemented the treatise published in the *Revista de Archivos* by his predecessor, the late Don

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Juan Monteros. Its plan is simple and intelligible, it gives full information as to the inventories and catalogues, and it is well indexed.

Many American students will be much disturbed to hear that a fire broke out in the Archives of the Indies at Seville on December 10. Four *estantes,* nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6 of Contaduria, were damaged, especially nos. 3 and 4, and perhaps seventy-five *legajos* were destroyed. With the exception of some Florida material, mostly accounts, little that affected North American history was lost.

No. 85–87 of the *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla* continues Señor Asensio's itemized list of documents in the Patronato section of the Archives of the Indies, finishing the papal bulls, embracing the papers relating to Columbus and his descendants, and proceeding among those relating to Cortés, so far that sixteen *legajos* have now been listed.

The Centro de Estudios Históricos of Madrid began in 1924 the publication of a periodical exclusively devoted to the history of Spanish law, *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español,* under the general editorship of Señor L. Díaz Canseco, professor of the history of law in the University of Madrid.

The *Fuero de Guadalajara, 1219,* edited by Mr. Howard Keniston (Princeton, University Press), is an excellent edition, from manuscripts in the libraries of Cornell University and of the Escorial, of an important municipal *fuero,* granted by Fernando III. on the basis of a *carta-puebla* of Alfonso VII., given in 1133.

The *Catalogue des Actes de Jaime I., Pedro III., Alfonso III., et Jaime II., Rois d'Aragon, concernant les Juifs, 1213–1327,* by Jean Régné (Privas, privately printed, 1924, pp. 117, 149, 171, 190), is the fruit of researches in the Aragonese archives at Barcelona, during which the author studied 140 registers of the royal chancery, covering the period of organization and expansion of Jewish communities in eastern Spain.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Rostan, *Note di Storia Giuridica; le Legge di Re Liutprando e la Condizione Giuridica della Donna* (Nuova Rivista Storica, July–October); H. Massoul, *Un Pèlerin de l'Année Sainte MCCCL., François Pétrarque* (Mercure de France, December 15); A. G. Canina, *La Restaurazione Finanziara ed il Sistema Tributario del Piemonte nella Seconda Metà del XVI. Secolo* (Nuova Antologia, November 16); L. Emery, *Religione e Politica nella Mente di Fra Paolo Sarpi,* concl. (Nuova Rivista Storica, July–October); P. Boselli, *Carlo Alberto* (Nuova Antologia, December 16); Angela Valente, *Un Dramma Politico alla Corte di Filippo II.; Antonio Perez e la Principessa d'Eboli,* concl. (Nuova Rivista Storica, July–October).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

General review: Paul E. Martin, *Histoire de Suisse, 1922–1923* (Revue Historique, January).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A new and useful reconstruction of German protohistory is Ernst Wahle's *Vorgeschichte des Deutschen Volkes: ein Grundriss* (Leipzig, Kabitzsch, 1924, pp. x, 189); elaborate bibliographies lend it further value.

The fourth fascicle of *Deutsche Schrifttafeln des IX. bis XVI. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Erich Petzet and Otto Glauning (Leipzig, Hiersemann, 1924), is a well-chosen selection from German manuscripts on parchment of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, reproduced in facsimile with accompanying text. The three earlier fascicles appeared before the war, which delayed the completion of the work; a final volume will appear shortly, devoted to manuscripts on paper from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries.

The publishing house of Wagner, of Innsbruck, announces the publication of a new volume, III. 2, of the important collection of the *Regesta Habsburgica*, the printing of which has been interrupted since the beginning of the war.

The Columbia University Press has published a monograph by Austin P. Evans, entitled *An Episode in the Struggle for Religious Freedom: the Sectaries of Nuremberg, 1524–1528.*

Hessische Biographien, vol. II., no. 3, edited by Hermann Haupt with the assistance of Karl Esselborn and Georg Lehnert (Darmstadt, Hessischer Staatsverlag, 1924, pp. 193–288), is the seventh whole number of the project, begun in 1912 by the Hessian Historical Commission. Among the biographies in the current issue is that of Karl Friedrich Ernst Minnigerode, who was successively German revolutionist, political prisoner and refugee, professor of classical literature in the College of William and Mary, and rector of St. Paul's Church, Richmond (and thus pastor of Jefferson Davis), during the Civil War.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Birger Nerman, *Die Herkunft und die Frühesten Auswanderungen der Germanen* (Kgl. Vitterhets Historie och Antiqvitets Akademiens Handlingar, third ser., I. 5); Fritz Rörig, *Aussenpolitische und Innerpolitische Wandlungen in der Hanse nach dem Stralsunder Frieden, 1370* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXI. 1); Lothar Gross, *Der Kampf zwischen Reichskanzlei und Oesterreichischer Hofkanzlei um die Führung der Auswärtigen Geschäfte* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXII. 2–3); Siegbert Neufeld, *Die Zeit der Judenschuldentilgungen und -schatzungen in Sachsen-Thüringen* (Thüringisch-Sächsische Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst, XII. 2); Friedrich Roth, *Die Geistliche Betrügerin, Anna Laminit von Augsburg, ca. 1480–1518* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XLIII. 2); Oskar von Wertheimer, *Bismarcks Bündnispolitik* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, December); Jul. Heyderhoff, *Kritische Parlamentstage im Alten Preussen* [from the correspondence of H. von Sybel] (Preussische Jahrbücher, November); Alfred Stern, *Gabriel Salamanca, Graf von Ortenburg* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXXI. 1); Ludwig Dehio, *Edwin von Manteuffels Poli-*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tische Ideen (*ibid.*); F. Thimme, *Die Krüger-Depesche: Genesis und Historische Bedeutung* (Europäische Gespräche, May–June, 1924); L. Raschdau, *Zum Kapitel Holstein* (Deutsche Rundschau, December); Gen. von Zwehl, *Die Gründe für unsere Ungenügende Rüstung 1914* (*ibid.*, November).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

In the *Mededeelingen* of the Dutch Historical Institute in Rome, vol. IV. (Hague, Nijhoff, 1924), Dr. J. Cornelissen reports large progress toward the Dutch Historical Commission's projected collection of documents on the history of Catholicism in the northern Netherlands in the first half of the seventeenth century. Besides papers on certain Pompeian buildings and on the Colosseum, there is a survey of the descriptions of Rome produced in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, by Dr. Raimond van Marle, and a list of Dutch descriptions of Italy and Rome, 1565–1900; Dr. A. H. L. Hensen illustrates the Dutch-English naval battle of March 4/14, 1653, off Leghorn, by contemporary Genoese letters; Dr. F. C. Wieder describes an important atlas by Johannes Vingboons, lately discovered in the Vatican Library, and apparently made for the Dutch West India Company.

We have received from the Belgian Commission Royale d'Histoire the long-delayed report of J. Laenen on *Les Archives de l'État à Vienne au point de vue de l'Histoire de Belgique* (Brussels, Kiessling, 1924, pp. xvi, 683) which, besides giving the most ample information on the materials for Belgian history of all periods, in the Vienna Staatsarchiv, can be of considerable service to other students in respect to that great repository.

Mr. Jervis Wegg, who had already published a book on Antwerp at the time of its prosperity, when it was the centre of the world's carrying trade, now publishes *The Decline of Antwerp under Philip of Spain* (London, Methuen, pp. 350).

The Belgian Commission Royale d'Histoire has now brought out the second and concluding quarto volume of the *Correspondance des Ministres de France accrédités à Bruxelles de 1780 à 1790* (Brussels, P. Imbreghts, 1924, pp. viii, 598), edited by Professor Eugène Hubert. It gives text or summary of some 350 despatches of the Chevalier de la Gravière and of Ruelle to Montmorin, from the middle of July, 1789, to the middle of July, 1790, with full notes that make it invaluable for that year of Belgian history.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Malcolm Letts, *The Administration of Criminal Law in Flanders, chiefly in the Fifteenth Century* (Law Quarterly Review, January); Alfred Stern, *König Leopold I. von Belgien und die Krisis von 1840* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXII. 2–3).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

Fornvännen for 1923 has an interesting paper by Sune Lindqvist on the old heathen temple at Uppsala, a discussion by Birger Nerman on the original home of the Goths, which he believes to have been Ostergötland and Westergötland, and a new reading and interpretation, by Haakon Shetelig, of the runic inscription, at Venice, on the lion from the Piraeus.

H. Aschehoug and Company of Copenhagen have begun the issue of a Danish dictionary of authors, compiled and printed at the expense of the Carlsberg Foundation, *Forfatterlexikon omfattende Danmark, Norge, og Island indtil 1814,* edited by H. Ehrencron-Müller. Writers that were still living after 1814 and are indicated in the works of Erslew and Halvorsen are excluded. Vol. I. runs from A through Bo.

The sixth volume of *Danmark-Norges Traktater,* edited by L. Laursen (Copenhagen, Gad), covers the period 1665–1675, the texts being accompanied by editorial narratives covering the history of Danish diplomacy in that period.

In the Norwegian *Historisk Tidsskrift,* fifth ser., VI. 3, appears a thoroughgoing mathematical study of the problem of the *eyktarstad* in the sagas respecting the voyages to Vinland, by the late M. Mjelde. Attention should also be called to the latest *Meddelelser om Grønland,* published by the commission for investigations in Greenland (Copenhagen, 1924, vol. LXVII.), describing fully the remarkable results of the Danish archaeological expedition to Herjolvsnes in 1921, which uncovered the remains of buildings, of skeletons, and even of clothing, proving continuance of the settlement there till at least the early years of the sixteenth century.

The Reformation in Poland: some Social and Economic Aspects, by Paul Fox, appears among the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science.*

Trotski's small but interesting book on *Lenin* has been issued in an authorized translation (New York: Minton, Balch, and Company).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: N. Brian-Chaninov, *Les Origines de la Russie Historique,* I. (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); B. Maklakoff, *La Russie de 1900 à 1917,* II., concl. (Revue de Paris, November 15, December 1); Michael Smilg-Benario, *Die Abdankung des Zaren* (Preussische Jahrbücher, January).

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

A valuable aid to scholars in its field is Dr. N. V. Michoff's *Sources Bibliographiques sur l'Histoire de la Turquie et de la Bulgarie,* vol. II. (Sofia, Bulgarische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1924, pp. 133). Vol. I., published in 1914, was concerned with the history of these countries; the present volume, with their inhabitants.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Modern Turkey (Macmillan), edited and in part written by Eliot G. Mears, lecturer in Stanford University, and formerly American trade commissioner at Athens and at Constantinople, is a survey of an encyclopaedic character, in which racial characteristics, religions, education, communications, land tenure, irrigation, agriculture, mines, commerce and treasury matters, government, and international relations are all described and discussed by competent authorities. Inevitably such descriptions and discussions contain, scattered here and there, more or less historical matter of the period since the rise of the young Turks.

A *Histoire Diplomatique de la Grèce de 1821 à Nos Jours,* in five volumes, by Édouard Driault and Michel Lhéritier, is in course of preparation. The first volume, embracing *L'Insurrection et l'Indépendance, 1821–1830,* by M. Driault, has just been published (Paris, Payot, 1925, pp. xvi, 476).

ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

The late Vincent A. Smith's *The Early History of India from 600 B. C. to the Muhammadan Conquest* is now issued by the Clarendon Press in a fourth edition, revised by S. M. Edwardes, late of the Indian civil service, with some aid from notes on various points recorded by Dr. Smith before his death.

The University of Coimbra has lately published a scholarly edition, by Dr. Joaquim de Carvalho, of Fernam Lopez de Castanheda's celebrated *Historia do Descobrimento e Conquista da India pe los Portugueses.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Bréhier, *Une Forteresse de l'Orient Latin; la Cité de Rhodes,* concl. (Journal des Savants, September); Adm. G. A. Ballard, *The War of the Arabian Sea* [1508–1509] (Mariner's Mirror, January); C. Huart, *Les Mamelouks en Syrie* (Journal des Savants, November).

AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

La Découverte de l'Afrique au Moyen Age (Cairo, Société Royale de Géographie d'Égypte, 2 vols.), by M. Charles de La Roncière, librarian of the Ministry of Marine in Paris, presents a comparative series of medieval maps with a learned commentary illustrative of them.

The second series of the *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de l'Algérie* is Georges Yver's *Documents relatifs au Traité de la Tafna, 1837* (Algiers, Carbonel, 1924, pp. xxii, 584), a treaty between General Bugeaud and Abd-el-Kader, regarded as the most important fact in Algerian history between 1830 and 1840.

L'Afrique du Nord devant le Parlement au XIX^e^ Siècle, 1828–1838 et 1880–1881, by René Valet (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. 256), unfolds with complete documentation the diplomatic and parliamentary phases of the occupation of Algeria and Tunis.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

M. Guillaume Grandidier, son of the eminent explorer of Madagascar, has published a model account of the work done by France in that country since 1880, *Le Myre de Villiers, Duchesne, Galliéni: Quarante Années de l'Histoire de Madagascar, 1880–1920* (Paris, Société d'Éditions Géographiques, 1924, pp. 254).

The life of a heroic missionary, whose activity in the heart of Africa lasted 44 years and of whom Jules Simon said that he had conquered for civilization and for France a territory three times as great as that of the mother country, finds record in *Mgr. Augouard, Archevêque Titulaire de Cassiopée, Vicaire Apostolique du Congo Français: sa Vie*, told by his friend Baron Jehan de Witte (Paris, Paul, 1924, pp. 370).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington is now sending to the press the completed manuscript of the *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, edited by Professor John S. Bassett, to be published in six octavo volumes. It has also received from Mrs. R. C. H. Catterall the first volume (of four) of her compilation of *Cases Illustrative of American Slavery, from the Judicial Reports*. Mr. David W. Parker, formerly keeper of the manuscript room in the Public Archives of Canada, has temporarily joined the staff of the Department, and is preparing for publication its *Guide to the Materials for American History in the Colonial Office Papers at London, and in the Archives of the British West Indies*. Mr. Matteson's *List of Manuscripts*, etc., is published this month.

In the session which ended March 4 Congress took several actions of interest to American history. The appropriation for printing the *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association had been reduced by the Bureau of the Budget, but Congress appropriated the usual $7000. A bill sponsored by Senator Ralston was passed, providing that, upon request from the governor of any state, the chief of the Division of Publications in the Department of State is authorized and directed to edit for publication those official papers of that state's territorial existence which are listed in Parker's *Calendar of Papers in Washington Archives relating to the Territories of the United States*. The edited texts can then be placed at the disposal of the state authorities (but the most suitable ultimate disposition of them would obviously be their issue by the federal government in one comprehensive publication). Provision was also made for carrying on during the next fiscal year the preparation of the State Department's contemplated publication of the instructions of the Secretaries of State to our ministers abroad. A commission, composed of four senators, four representatives, and eight persons appointed by the President, was instituted to make plans on an adequate scale for the com-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

memoration in 1932 of the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington. Commissions, of lesser functions, were also provided for government participation in the celebration of the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversaries of the battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill, respectively, and "of the patriotic action of the citizens of Mecklenburg county, N. C., in May 1775, in declaring their independence of the English crown".

Among recent accessions of the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress are two documents relating to De Soto's expedition of 1540; papers of E. C. Genet, 1754–1834; of Edmund Burke, of New Hampshire, 1834–1880; of Senator Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, 1854–1898; and of Dr. Mahlon Loomis, 1858–1886, relating to his experiments in wireless telegraphy; also letters of Nicholas Biddle to William Ayres, 1840–1843, and of Philip Kearny, 1861–1862, and a photostat of the diary kept in 1847 by Franklin Pierce.

As a supplementary volume to the *Chronicles of America* series, Messrs. Ralph H. Gabriel and Arthur B. Darling have prepared *The Yale Course of Home Study based on the Chronicles of America* (Yale University Press, pp. 301), in which detailed references and suggestions are given for the use of the series in the manner indicated by the title. Meantime, the admirable series of motion-pictures provided by the Yale University Press under the title of the "Chronicles of America Photoplays" is prepared to do a most valuable work in bringing to schoolchildren and adults vivid reproductions of dramatic incidents in American history and of the social environment of past times.

By a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the Bibliographical Society of America has been enabled to undertake the completion of the late Joseph Sabin's *Dictionary of Books relating to America*, of which the portions thus far printed end with the name of Smith.

Volume XVI. of the *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris* (1924) contains, in addition to the usual contributions in ethnology, anthropology, and philology, three articles of historical character: "The Oldest Known Illustration of South American Indians", by Rudolph Schuller, a critical examination of the print reproduced in Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History*, II. 19; "Les Allemands à la Louisiane au XVIII^{e} Siècle", by René Le Conte; and "La Louisiane de Chateaubriand", by Baron Marc de Villiers. Of especial value is the "Bibliographie Américaniste", compiled by P. Rivet, which fills 86 pages at the end of the volume. Here are enumerated and classified about two thousand books and articles chiefly of the last three years relating to North, Central, and South America, and the West Indies. The bibliography is especially rich in items published in Europe and South America.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The organ of the American Library in Paris, *Ex Libris,* in its issue for January, 1925, contains a list of American Studies among French Doctoral Theses. Forty-seven theses are here listed, of which only two were published in 1900; of the forty-seven, fifteen relate to subjects in history and political science. Most of them were carried on in the University of Paris, but three were prepared at Montpellier, two each at Grenoble and Toulouse, and one each at Dijon, Lyons, Marseilles, and Rennes.

The firm of Putnam has brought out a volume by Perry Belmont entitled *National Isolation an Illusion; Political Independence not Isolation; Interdependence of the United States and Europe,* written to maintain the contention that the United States has never been isolated and that there has been no break in the interdependence of the United States and Europe.

Among recently published aids to college and high-school students of American history we note a *List of References on the History of the United States,* by Professor Thomas P. Martin, of the University of Texas; *Thought Questions for Students of American History,* by Fayette E. Moyer, of the DeWitt Clinton High School in New York City; and a *Syllabus of Hispanic-American History, Colonial Period,* by J. Lloyd Mecham, of Columbia University.

In vol. XXIII. of the *Journal* of the American-Irish Historical Society, besides commemorations of many individuals, we find an Irish schoolmaster's letter written in Latin, in 1749, to Sir William Johnson, and the official report of "General" Thomas W. Sweeny, "Secretary of War of the Fenian Brotherhood, and Commander-in-Chief of the Irish Republican Army", respecting the Fenian invasion of Canada in 1866.

The *Year-Book* of the Swedish Historical Society of America for 1923–1924 contains three interesting contributions: one on Early Efforts at Scandinavian Church Union in America, by Professor A. A. Stomberg of the University of Minnesota; one on the earliest Swedes in Minnesota (in Swedish, "Staten Iowas Första Svenskar"), by G. N. Swan; and some seventy pages of Swedish letters of pioneer days, 1849–1863, edited and translated by Professor Conrad Petersen of Augustana College from manuscripts in Rock Island (Augustana College and Augustana Book Concern), together with some Civil War letters of Col. Hans Mattson, from the collections of the Minnesota Historical Society.

The December issue of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* contains a chronological list showing the dates of appointment of the bishops of the United States, including also the names of American bishops appointed to sees outside the United States proper, compiled by Rt. Rev. Owen B. Corrigan, auxiliary bishop of Baltimore; an account of Catholic Missionary Work among the Colored People of the United States (1776–1886), by Rev. Stephen L. Theobald; a Brief Account of the Services, during the Civil War, of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Phila-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

delphia; and a continuation of the story of the Work of the Sisters of Mercy in the United States, by Sister M. Eulalia Herron.

American Members of the Inns of Court (London, St. Catherine Press), by E. Alfred Jones, is the fruit of thorough and long-continued studies, and will be of great value not only to students of American education and legal history but to those interested in the biography of eminent political characters in the United States.

Charles E. Cartwright is the author of a volume, *The Tale of our Merchant Ships,* which describes the evolution of the American merchant marine from its early beginnings to the period of the Great War (Dutton).

Waldemar Kaempffert, formerly managing editor of the *Scientific American* and editor of *Popular Science Monthly,* has written *A Popular History of American Invention,* in two volumes (illustrated), which the firm of Scribner has published.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

In *La Découverte de l'Amérique par les Normands vers l'an 1000: Deux Sagas Islandaises* (Paris, Société d'Éditions Géographiques, 1925), Lt.-Col. Langlois gives a translation of the sagas of Erik the Red and of Thorfinn Karlsefni, together with a study of the possibilities of these expeditions.

The Discovery of North America Twenty Years before Columbus is the title of a volume of which Sofus Larsen is the author and B. Thorsen (3042 Clifton Avenue, Chicago) is the publisher.

A Bibliography of American Natural History: the Pioneer Century, 1769–1865 (New York, Premier Publishing Company, vol. I., pp. 244), by Max Meisel, is a work in three volumes, tracing bibliographically the rise and progress of natural history in the United States from the formation of an active American Philosophical Society till the close of the Civil War, and the part played in such studies during that period by institutions and individual naturalists.

Vol. VIII. of the *Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée,* under the direction of MM. Baldensperger and Hazard, is an interesting study of *Les Amitiés Américaines de Madame d'Houdetot, d'après sa Correspondance Inédite avec Benjamin Franklin et Thomas Jefferson,* by Professor Gilbert Chinard of the Johns Hopkins University (Paris, Champion, 1924, pp. viii, 62). The correspondence covers the years from 1781 to 1791, with a single letter in 1806. Of further interest to students of Franco-American relations is vol. VII. in the same series, *L'Esprit Révolutionnaire en France et aux États-Unis à la Fin du XVIII^e Siècle,* accompanied by a *Bibliographie Critique des Ouvrages Français publiés aux États-Unis,* by Professor Bernard Faÿ of Clermont-Ferrand (Paris, Champion, 1924, 2 vols., pp. 378, 108).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Professor Reginald C. McGrane has brought out through the University of Chicago Press a study, *The Panic of 1837: some Financial Problems of the Jacksonian Era.*

The Bobbs-Merrill Company, of Indianapolis, announces the *Life of Abraham Lincoln,* in two volumes, by Rev. William E. Barton.

A quarto booklet of the University of Chicago Press, *Lincoln's Last Speech in Springfield in the Campaign of 1858,* presents for the first time, in handsome form, a brief but important speech in which Lincoln, on October 30, ended the campaign for the senatorship. A narrative of the occasion from the Springfield *Journal* and a letter of John H. Morgan, who was present, are added.

The *Life and Letters of Mary Putnam Jacobi,* by her sister Miss Ruth Putnam, is to be published this spring by Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons. Mrs. Jacobi was one of the pioneers in the movement for the emancipation of women, and one of the first women in America to qualify as a physician.

The Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society has brought out the *Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes, Nineteenth President of the United States,* in two volumes, edited by Charles R. Williams.

Of *The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson,* educational, literary, and political, which Mr. Ray Stannard Baker and Professor William E. Dodd are editing, two volumes have appeared, with the subtitle *College and State, 1875–1913* (Harper). The whole series will run to six volumes.

Smith College Studies in History, vol. X., no. 1, is a useful little treatise (pp. 91) on Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Mexico under Porfirio Díaz, 1876–1910, by Miss Pauline S. Relyea.

Growth of American Trade Unions, 1880–1923, by Leo Wolman, is published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, 474 West 24th Street, New York.

Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons announce for publication this spring a volume of *Selections from the Correspondence of Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge, 1884–1918,* of importance in respect to political history and many other matters.

Messrs. Doubleday, Page, and Company have brought out *Roosevelt and the Russo-Japanese War,* by Dr. Tyler Dennett, of the Department of State.

After a long interruption, the series of volumes commonly called *Foreign Relations* has been resumed, by the publication of *Papers relating to Foreign Relations of the United States, 1915* (Government Printing Office, pp. cxvi, 1330). American diplomatic correspondence relating to the War of 1914–1918 will be printed in supplementary volumes of *Foreign Relations.*

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Friedrich Schönemann, a German settled in the United States for many years and resident here throughout the war, publishes an account of American propaganda against Germany during that period, in a volume entitled *Die Kunst der Massenbeeinflussung in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt).

The Federal Farm Loan Bureau: its History, Activities, and Organization, by William S. Holt, is no. 34 of the *Service Monographs of the United States Government* issued by the Institute for Government Research (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press).

A biography of Dr. William C. Gorgas the younger, distinguished as the conqueror of yellow fever, has been prepared by his wife, Marie D. Gorgas, in collaboration with Burton J. Hendrick, and published by Doubleday, Page, and Company. It bears the title *William Crawford Gorgas: his Life and his Work.*

Messrs. Duffield have included in their *Contemporary Statesmen* series *The Life of John W. Davis,* by Theodore A. Huntley, edited, with a compilation of speeches, by Horace Green.

Recollections of the late William D. McCrackan (1864–1923), author of *The Rise of the Swiss Republic,* are presented in a little volume, *An American Abroad and at Home* (New York, M. E. Starr, pp. 220), containing much that is interesting respecting school days in Vevey and Stuttgart, later travels, and the writing of the book named.

LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

Maine Forts, by Henry E. Dunnack, state librarian, gives historical sketches of eight old disused forts lately bought by the state from the federal government. Pictures and maps illustrate the volume.

The Maine Historical Society has brought out the *Vital Records of Hallowell, Maine,* vol. I., edited by Mabel G. Hall.

The October serial of the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society has a thoroughgoing paper by G. G. Wolkins, supported by many documents, and calculated to modify some existing conclusions, on Daniel Malcom and Writs of Assistance. In that of November Dr. Gardner W. Allen narrates the case of Captain John Penny of the *Roebuck,* 1659–1660.

The Salem Witch Trials: a Chapter of New England History is characterized as containing such of the court records of Salem as are available to-day (Chicago, McClurg).

The January number of the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* contains, besides continued articles hitherto mentioned, an initial paper by Martha W. F. Duren entitled Three Generations of Silsbees and their Vessels.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Dukes County Historical Society, of Edgartown, Mass., has ready a third volume, genealogical in character, to be published as a supplement to Dr. Charles E. Banks's excellent *History of Martha's Vineyard,* published in two volumes in 1911.

Vol. II., no. 2, of the *Contributions* of the Lowell Historical Society contains a paper by Rev. Wilson Waters on William Blaxton, the first settler of Boston; Reminiscences of Lowell Booksellers, by Hon. Samuel P. Hadley; and a number of good short essays in Lowell history by high-school pupils.

A *History of Worcester County, Massachusetts,* in three volumes, is put forth by the Lewis Historical Publishing Company.

The Connecticut Historical Society has recently received a valuable set of papers relating to the history of the town of Durham. The society has just issued vol. XXI. of its *Collections,* consisting of the papers of the Wyllys family from 1590 to 1796, and containing much that is important to the history of colony and state. The society is planning to erect soon a new building to house its collections. Funds for the purpose, now amounting to more than $300,000, were bequeathed to the society by Mr. George E. Hoadley.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The secretary of state of New York has transferred to the State Library, among other documents, 63 volumes of land papers listed in the *Calendar* printed in 1864 and 83 volumes of papers relating to the possessions and operations of the Holland Land Company.

The January number of the *Quarterly Journal* of the New York State Historical Association has an account of the annual meeting of the association, at Buffalo, October 1 to 3, with the inaugural address of the president, Dr. Frank H. Severance, and an address by Jane Mead Welch on Buffalo and the Presidents.

The Holland Society of New York is preparing a book on old Dutch houses of New Netherland. There will be two volumes, abundantly illustrated, one dealing with the houses of Long Island, Manhattan, Staten Island, and New Jersey, to be prepared by Miss Helen Henry, the other dealing with the houses of the Hudson River above New York, to be prepared by Miss Helen W. Reynolds.

An illustrated article on Belt Plates and Badges of the British Army in the American Revolution, by William L. Carver, appears in the January number of the New York Historical Society's *Bulletin.*

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library prints in its November and December issues, from the library's collection of manuscripts relating to early days in the West, Flatboating on the Yellowstone, 1877, by Fred G. Bond. The same numbers contain a useful list of references to the Folk Music of the Western Hemisphere.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The annual *Report* of the Buffalo Historical Society contains, besides the usual detailed record of local historical events, an interesting paper on Early Buffalo Gunsmiths, with remarks on the "Kentucky" rifle, by R. W. Bingham.

Notes on Mahikan Ethnology, by Alanson Skinner, is issued as a separate of the *Bulletin* of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee, Jan. 20, 1925.

The New Jersey Historical Society has recently acquired a body of letters and commissions of General Philip Kearny, embracing more than sixty letters written by him from the seat of war in 1861–1862; a collection of some two hundred autograph letters and documents of New Jersey governors and senators, 1770–1913; and a record of appropriations by Parliament for the province of New Jersey, 1762–1775, kept by Samuel Smith, its treasurer and historian.

The January number of the *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society includes a sketch, by J. F. Folsom, of the Life of Jonathan W. Roberts (1821–1912), president of the New Jersey Historical Society; an article by Professor Irving S. Kull on the New Brunswick Adventurers of '49; one by Professor Charles A. Philhower on the Indians of Somerset County; and a note by W. I. Lincoln Adams, Lafayette in Cranestown (Montclair), which includes a letter from Lafayette to a kinsman, written from "Near Crane's Town", Oct. 28, 1780. The society has issued vol. III. (1751–1760) of the *Calendar of New Jersey Wills, Administrations,* etc. (*Archives of the State of New Jersey,* first ser., vol. XXXII.), edited for the committee on colonial documents by A. Van Doren Honeyman.

The January number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* contains an interesting study, by Joseph E. Agan, of the career of the Abbé Corrêa da Serra (1750–1823), distinguished Portuguese botanist, and minister to the United States 1816–1820. There is also a diary, by an unknown hand, of a journey made in 1822 from Horsham, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, to New Lisbon, Ohio, and return. The Diary of Elisha Williams (1776) is concluded.

The Deutsches Ausland-Institut of Stuttgart has recently published a monograph by M. Lohmann on *Die Bedeutung der Deutschen Ansiedlungen in Pennsylvania* (pp. 153).

History of the Apprentices' Library of Philadelphia, 1820–1920, the Oldest Free Circulating Library in America, by John F. Lewis, is published in Philadelphia by the author (208 South Fourth Street).

In the issue of *Papers* read before the Lancaster County Historical Society, November 7, is the report of the committee to place and unveil a marker designating and commemorating the Indian town of Conestoga, embodying an historical account of the locality, addresses, and documents.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the issue of December 6 is a similar report upon the White Swan Tavern, with an historical sketch by D. F. Magee.

Lancaster County, Pennsylvania: a History, in four volumes, edited by Harry M. J. Klein, is put forth by the Lewis Historical Publishing Company of New York.

The principal contents of the January number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* are: the Depreciation and Donation Lands, by John E. Winner; the Romantic Story of Baron Basse, Founder of Zelienople, by Dettmar Passavant; the Election of 1864 in Western Pennsylvania, by Norman C. Brilhart; and Origin of the Names given to the Counties in Pennsylvania, by James McKirdy.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

Mr. A. L. Newsome, assistant professor of history in the University of North Carolina, has in preparation a study on the Southern Negro during the Civil War, the purpose of which is to determine the interrelations of the war and slavery and the rôle of the negro in the South during that conflict.

The *Maryland Historical Magazine* announces its purpose to print the rent rolls of the several counties of the state and begins with the publication in the December number of the rent rolls, 1700–1724, of Baltimore County (then much more extensive than at the present time). The series of depositions from the land records and the letter-books of Dr. Charles Carroll of Annapolis (1733) are continued, as is also Edward S. Delaplaine's Life of Thomas Johnson. William S. Rusk presents an extensive body of Notes on the Life of W. H. Rinehart, Sculptor.

The *Records,* vol. XXVI., of the Columbia Historical Society, edited by John B. Larner, is from the press (Washington, the Society).

The Virginia State Library, which has reproduced by photostat such vestry books and parish registers of the colonial times in Virginia as it can find, would like to know of others. The librarian would also like to hear of any likenesses of the following Revolutionary officers: Maj.-Gens. Charles Scott, Adam Stephen, and Edward Stevens, Brig.-Gens. George Baylor, William Campbell, Robert Lawson, Andrew Lewis, George Mathews, John Neville, Joseph Neville, William Russell, and Evan Shelby.

The Virginia War History Commission has published as its second source volume, *Virginia War History in Newspaper Clippings,* Arthur K. Davis editor.

The Virginia Historical Society is about to reproduce as complete a file of the *Virginia Gazette* from 1736 to 1789, under whatever printer, as can be found, and would like to know (by note to Mr. W. G. Stanard) of any volumes, numbers, or fragments of a number that are in private possession.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Fairfax Harrison contributes to the January number of the *Virginia Magazine of History* some fresh materials concerning the career of Henry Norwood (1615–1689), treasurer of Virginia 1661–1673, and author of *A Voyage to Virginia.* The council journals printed in this number, to which there are more than twenty pages of editorial notes, are of the early months of 1728. In the series, the Virginia Clergy, are eleven letters (1738–1744) from Governor William Gooch. The Kennon letters (1811–1812) are continued, and there are further notes on the Valley of Virginia, contributed by Charles E. Kemper.

The *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* prints in the January number, under the title, Charles Bellini, First Professor of Modern Languages in an American College, some correspondence between Jefferson and Bellini (1782–1799), together with other letters and documents (1805–1817) pertaining to the settlement of Bellini's estate. Mr. W. E. MacClenny contributes some materials on the Yeates Free Schools, including the will of John Yeates (1731), extracts from the vestry records (1778–1784), and from the Yeates Free School Catalogue (1861).

The January number of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* contains a reprint, from the Baltimore *Sun,* of an article by Dr. Matthew P. Andrews, entitled the Myths of American History, to which the editor prefixes some additions and some pungent commentaries. The English Genealogy of Baron George Washington is an article by the English genealogist, T. Pape. The *Magazine* prints in this number a series of letters (1818–1825) from Francis W. Gilmer to John Randolph of Roanoke, with one (1827) from P. R. Gilmer, a brother.

County history in Virginia has of late made remarkable progress. Mr. W. W. Scott's *History of Orange County* has now been followed by a *History of Halifax County* (Richmond, Appeals Press, 1924, pp. 525), by Mrs. Wirt J. Carrington, an excellent volume of the sort, and the Fauquier Historical Society has just completed the first volume of its *Bulletin* (Richmond, Old Dominion Press, pp. 509) containing many valuable contributions.

Lewis County in the Civil War, by Roy B. Cook, is from the press of the Jarrett Printing Company, Charleston, W. Va.

The *Tenth Biennial Report* (1922–1924) of the North Carolina Historical Commission records many valuable accessions. Besides numerous additions to the collections of private papers, early official records (for instance, the records of the ports of Roanoke, Bath, and Newbern), and important Revolutionary, Confederate, and World War records, the commission has acquired sundry records and papers by transfer from the office of the secretary of state, and from some thirty-five counties many volumes of wills, marriage bonds, county minutes, etc. One acquisition of interest, some early copies of the *North Carolina Gazette,* is described below. Photostats of copies of the *North Carolina Journal,* 1792–1798,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have also been obtained from the Massachusetts Historical Society. The commission has in press vol. II. of the *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina,* and *The Papers of John Steele,* in two volumes, edited by H. M. Wagstaff.

In the January number of the *North Carolina Historical Review* appear two articles, one an appropriate study entitled Culture and the New Era in North Carolina, by W. C. Jackson, the other an admirable discourse upon the Problem of Historical Interpretation, by B. B. Kendrick. The *Review* reprints, from a rare pamphlet of 1740, "A True and Faithful Narrative of the Proceedings of the House of Burgesses of North Carolina", pertaining to the attempt to impeach William Smith, chief justice of the province, in 1739. Professor W. K. Boyd furnishes an introduction. There is also a note by D. L. Corbitt concerning the *North Carolina Gazette,* in particular concerning the recent discovery of some issues antedating any hitherto known, the earliest being an issue of Nov. 15, 1751, and bearing the number 15, which places the beginning of the *Gazette* in July of that year.

The Charleston Stage in the XVIII. Century, with Social Settings of the Time, by Eola Williams, has been brought out by the State Company, Columbia.

The December number of the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* includes a continuation of Professor P. S. Flippin's study of the Royal Government in Georgia, 1752–1776; an article by Dr. J. G. Johnson of the University of Colorado on Myths, Legends, Miracles, and Mysteries, related by the first Historians of Florida; and the Memoir of Moses Waddel (1770–1840), the noted Georgia teacher, relating his educational and religious experiences of the years 1777–1791.

A *History of Tugalo Baptist Association,* by Rev. J. F. Goode, is brought out by the Toccoa *Record,* Toccoa, Ga.

The Florida Historical Society, incorporated in 1905, began in 1908 the publication of a quarterly magazine, of which six numbers were issued in that year and in 1909, but publication was then suspended. Last year its publication was resumed, the first issue being printed in July and the second in October. The January number of the *Florida Historical Society Quarterly* (vol. III., no. 3) contains some papers respecting the Seminole War, a discussion of the Landing Places of Narvaez and De Soto, by A. H. Phinney, and an address by Senator Fletcher.

The firm of Heath has brought out *A Short History of Florida,* prepared by James M. Leake as a supplement to Waddy Thompson's *History of the American People.*

The Alabama State Department of Archives and History began in January the issue of a monthly bulletin in mimeograph form intended to present to the public, within and without the state, the results of the de-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partment's work, its accessions, and notes of research work of an historical nature by societies or individuals within the state. The January number presents an article on Alabama Capitals (St. Stephens, Cahaba, Tuscaloosa, and Montgomery), by Peter A. Brannon.

Among the contents of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* for October, 1923 (published in December, 1924), are: a Chapter of Colonial History, translated from the French and read before the society some years ago by Dr. Gustave Devron; the Inauguration of De Vaudreuil, governor of Louisiana 1743, translated by Mrs. H. H. Cruzat; a Session of the Superior Council of Louisiana in 1744, by Henry P. Dart; the Trial of Mary Glass for Murder, 1780, translated from the Spanish judicial records, with an introduction by Mr. Dart.

WESTERN STATES

The articles in the December number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* are: Anti-Slavery Tendencies of the Democratic Party in the Northwest, 1848–1850, by William O. Lynch; the Mississippi Valley and the Constitution, 1815–1829, by Curtis Nettels; Major Lawrence Taliaferro, Indian Agent, by Willoughby M. Babcock, jr.; and the Efforts of the Democratic Societies of the West to Open the Navigation of the Mississippi, by E. Merton Coulter. In the section of Notes and Documents is William Trent's Journal at Fort Pitt, 1763, edited by A. T. Volwiler. The March number contains articles concerning the Background of Populism in Kansas, by Raymond C. Miller; Local Defense and the Overthrow of the Confederacy, a paper read at the December meeting of the American Historical Association by Frank L. Owsley; Ohio and the Greenback Movement, by Reginald C. McGrane; and Confederate Leadership at Vicksburg, by Thomas R. Hay. David K. Bjork has translated and edited some documents relating to the establishment of schools in Louisiana, 1771, and Everett S. Brown contributes some letters of J. C. M. Windship from Louisiana, 1813–1814.

The *Publications,* 1924, of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio includes the society's annual report and the seventh installment of the Gano Papers. The latter, which are of the period 1814–1817, include correspondence of General Gano with William Henry Harrison and others, division orders, muster rolls, etc.

The *Transactions* of the Western Reserve Historical Society (annual report for the years 1923–1924) records among the acquisitions of the society a file of the *Scioto Gazette,* the oldest continuous newspaper in the state of Ohio, dating from about April, 1800. The file begins with August, 1801. Among the manuscripts acquired are seven volumes of journals of some Florida plantations.

The legislature of Indiana has passed a bill putting the State Library, the Library Commission, the Legislative Reference Bureau, and the His-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

torical Commission in a consolidated department known as the Library and Historical Department, under a commission of five members, appointed by the governor on nomination by appropriate existing bodies. Provision is made for an advisory committee to co-operate with the Historical Bureau, in place of the existing Historical Commission. The bureau announces that vol. IV. of *The Governors' Messages and Letters*, edited by Dr. Logan Esarey, will shortly be sent to the printer.

The Indiana Historical Society has received, by bequest of the late Delavan Smith, a library of some 10,000 volumes, collected by him and his father, William Henry Smith, and $131,000 for the establishment and maintenance of the William Henry Smith Memorial Library, which will apparently be placed in the World War Memorial Building to be erected by the state of Indiana.

In the December number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* Mr. George W. Purcell presents a Survey of Early Newspapers in the Middle Western States. The *Indiana History Bulletin* for January includes the address of Dr. William E. Barton, delivered before the Indiana History Conference in December, on Abraham Lincoln's Ancestry.

The *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* devotes a double number (October, 1923–January, 1924) to the Life of Stephen Arnold Douglas, by Frank E. Stevens. The succeeding issue of the *Journal*, which is also a double number (April–July, 1924), has among its articles a History of Headquarters Company, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Field Artillery (1917–1919), by William E. Gilmore; Great Dates and Deeds of Illinois, by Rev. F. F. Shannon; and Professor Jonathan Baldwin Turner and the Granville Convention, by D. M. Inman. The October number includes a biographical sketch of John L. Scripps, Lincoln's campaign biographer, compiled from his letters, by his daughter, Grace L. Scripps Dyche; an Episode of the Civil War, being the experiences of Col. Edward R. Roberts, from the pen of Josephine C. Chanler; an account of Shabonee, chief of Pottawatomies, by Mrs. Alta P. Walters; and a sketch, by Thomas Rinaker, of Gideon Blackburn, founder of Blackburn University.

The January number of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* is devoted to articles commemorating the two-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the arrival and sojourn of Father Marquette on the site of Chicago. Chief among these articles is one by Joseph J. Thompson on Persons and Places associated with the History of Father Marquette; an installment of a *250th Anniversary History of Illinois*, by the same author; Marquette and Illinois, by Hon. Quin O'Brien; and the Spirit of Marquette, by Rev. Herbert C. Noonan, S.J.

The Chicago Historical Society has recently received the first installment, and will receive others, of the papers of George Schneider, editor of the *Illinois Staatszeitung* in the period of the Civil War and later.

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Among the contents of the January number of the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* are: Logan County Tax Lists, 1795; Kentucky Officers in the Regular Army, 1789–1900, compiled by the late A. C. Quisenbery; and a further installment of the Early Political Papers of Governor James T. Morehead.

Mr. Willard R. Jillson, state geologist of Kentucky, has in press (Louisville, the Standard Printing Company) a volume entitled *Kentucky Land Grants,* which is described as a complete index to all land grants in Kentucky. Hitherto no index to these grants and warrants has existed; this volume therefore, which is the result of long and patient labor on the part of Mr. Jillson, will be a welcome contribution to the documentary history and genealogical record of the state. It will appear as no. 33 of the Filson Club *Publications.*

In a paper originally read before the Filson Club of Louisville, and now privately printed as a pamphlet, Mr. Young E. Allison discusses *The Curious Legend of Louis Philippe in Kentucky.* It is an interesting and acute piece of historical criticism.

The Michigan Historical Commission has issued *Michigan in the World War: Military and Naval Honors of Michigan Men and Women,* compiled by Charles H. Landrum. The volume consists of lists of those who have received the Congressional medal of honor, the distinguished service cross, the distinguished service medal, naval decoration, and foreign decorations, with brief accounts of the services for which the decorations were awarded.

In the January number of the *Michigan History Magazine* Thomas E. Johnson contributes a study of Fifty Years of Michigan's Progress in Education, 1873–1923; John W. Fitzgerald gives an account of Early Country Newspaper Publishers in Michigan; Henry A. Haigh describes the Ford Collections at Dearborn; and LeRoy Pearson presents a biographical sketch of the late Maj.-Gen. William G. Haan.

The *Burton Historical Collection Leaflet* of January contains an article by M. M. Quaife on the Mansion of St. Martin. In that for March, Clarence M. Burton gives a biographical sketch of John Askin, who was closely connected with the early commercial history of Detroit and the Northwest.

The Minnesota Historical Society has acquired a valuable body of papers of Joel B. Bassett, Chippewa Indian agent from Minnesota, 1859–1868. The society profited by the expedition of Mr. Gunnar Malmin, made on behalf of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, by obtaining transcripts of seven of the rarest pamphlets published in Norway between 1837 and 1854 on emigration to America. The articles in the November number of the *Minnesota History Bulletin* are: the People's Party in Minnesota, by John D. Hicks; New Light on Red River Valley History,

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Grace L. Nute; and an account of the State Historical Convention at Detroit.

The Minnesota War Records Commission has published as vol. I. of a series to cover the participation of *Minnesota in the World War,* a *History of the 151st Field Artillery, Rainbow Division,* by Lieut.-Gov. Louis L. Collins, edited by Dr. Wayne E. Stevens. In addition to the history proper, illustrated by maps and an interesting group of photographs, there are 135 pages of documents, and a roster of the regiment. The *Third Biennial Report* (1923–1924) of the commission includes a descriptive catalogue of the manuscript material assembled by it.

The State Historical Society of Iowa now has in press the fourth volume of the *Applied History* series, a volume on county government and administration in Iowa. Members of the staff of the State Historical Society have arranged to give a series of talks on interesting topics in Iowa history from the radio broadcasting station of the State University at Iowa City, on each Friday noon, from February to June, inclusive. The *University of Iowa Extension Bulletin,* no. 113 (December 1), contains a paper on the Interrelation of Canadian and United States History, by Dr. Carl Wittke.

The January number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* contains a study of the Historical Background of the County in Iowa, by Ivan L. Pollock; an historical study of the Code of 1924, its making, nature, and problems of construction, by Jacob A. Swisher; a survey of the Legislation of the Extra Session of the Fortieth General Assembly of Iowa, by Jacob Van Ek; and an examination of the history and procedure of amendment of the Iowa constitution, by Carol H. Erbe. In the January number of the *Palimpsest* George F. Robeson has three articles on the fur trade, the first being devoted to Manuel Lisa.

The contents of the July number of the *Annals of Iowa* include some reminiscences of Hon. George W. Clarke, Bygone Days in Drakeville; an account, prepared jointly by the members of the Iowa Suffrage Memorial Commission, of the suffrage movement in Iowa; an address by Edgar R. Harlan, entitled Scenic, Scientific, and Historic Iowa Areas; and a letter from General Beauregard to Mrs. John Tyler, dated at Manassas, Aug. 10, 1861.

Some two years ago the State Historical Society of Missouri brought out the first three volumes of *The Messages and Proclamations of the Governors of the State of Missouri,* compiled and edited by Grace G. Avery and Floyd C. Shoemaker. Vols. IV., V., and VI. of the series have now appeared, bringing the materials to the close of Governor Crittenden's administration at the beginning of 1885. There are biographical sketches of each of the governors, by hands other than those of the editors.

Mr. Floyd C. Shoemaker contributes to the January number of the *Missouri Historical Review* an article on the Pioneer, and N. D. Hough-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ton one on the Initiative and Referendum in Missouri. There is also found in this number a Missouri Chronicle, 1673–1924, arranged by months and days, by Sarah Guitar and Floyd C. Shoemaker.

The January number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* includes Juan N. Almonte's *Statistical Report on Texas* (1835), translated by Professor Carlos E. Castañeda; and an article by Lena C. Koch on the Federal Indian Policy in Texas, 1845–1860.

The Men who made Texas Free; the Signers of the Texas Declaration of Independence: Sketches of their Lives and Patriotic Services to the Republic and State, by Samuel Houston Dixon, has been published in Houston by the Texas History Publishing Company.

The State Historical Society of North Dakota has brought out vol. V. of its *Collections* (1923), edited by Professor O. G. Libby.

Among the articles in the September number of *Chronicles of Oklahoma* are: French Interests and Activities in Oklahoma, by Anna Lewis; Protestant Missions among the Osages, by M. L. Wardell; Red River and the Spanish Boundary in the United States Supreme Court, by Grant Foreman; and Folk-Lore of the Southwest, by J. Frank Dobie.

The *Biennial Report* of the State Historical and Natural History Society of Colorado, Dec. 1, 1922, to Nov. 30, 1924, reviews the miscellaneous activities of the departments of archaeology and ethnology, history, natural history, and the library.

The January number of the *Colorado Magazine* contains an article by L. R. Hafen on the Early Mail Service to Colorado, 1858–1860.

The *Quarterly Bulletin* of the State of Wyoming Historical Department, January 15, contains an article by C. M. Owens on the Fur Traders, and some letters and notes from the office of the surveyor general, 1870–1871.

An illustrated *History of the University of Nevada,* by Samuel B. Doten, has been published by the university.

The New Mexico Historical Society's *Publications,* no. 24, is the Story of the Conquest of Santa Fe, New Mexico, and the Building of Old Fort Marcy, 1846, by R. E. Twitchell. No. 27 is Early Vaccination in New Mexico, by L. B. Bloom.

In the January number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* are found an account, by Herbert H. Gowen, of the First Japanese Mission to America; the first installment of a history of Old Fort Colville, by J. O. Oliphant; a representation of two Wanatchee Indians, Jan. 3, 1910, touching a question of treaty rights; an account, by C. S. Kingston, of the visit to Spokane in 1893 of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, whose assassination precipitated the Great War; and an initial installment of the Diary of Lieutenant Charles Wilkes, U. S. N., who was in command

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the exploring expedition of 1838–1842. The latter is edited, with an introduction, by Professor Edmond S. Meany.

The December number of the *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society contains an article, by Fred S. Perrine, on Early Days on the Willamette; an address, by Hon. Binger Hermann, at the Port Orford Homecoming and Reunion, August, 1924; an article by Fred Lockley on the McNemees and Tetherows with the Migration of 1845, with documents; and the second installment of John T. Ganoe's study of the Oregon and California Railroad.

In the November number of the *California History Nugget* are second installments of the articles on Life in Early California and California's Early Transportation and Mail Service, and a brief account of the first state election, Nov. 13, 1849.

The *History of the Bench and Bar of California,* of which Oscar T. Shuck is editor, includes studies from several hands, among them an Historical Review of the Judiciary System of California, by Henry H. Reid; a Review of the Military Civil Government, 1846–1850, by Samuel W. Holliday; the Birth of the Commonwealth, by Professor Rockwell D. Hunt; Adoption of the Common Law, by the editor; the Bonanza Suits of 1877, by John H. Burke; Irrigation Laws and Decisions of California, by John D. Works (Chicago, Charles T. Powner Company). The same firm has brought out a *History of San Diego,* by William E. Smythe.

The *Annual Publications* (1923) of the Historical Society of Southern California includes an article by George W. Beattie on San Bernardino Valley in the Spanish Period; one by Herbert D. Austin entitled New Light on the Name of California; one by Orra E. Monette on Fort Moore and the Battle of San Pasqual; An Emigrant's Trip across the Plains in 1859, being the reminiscences of William H. Knight, with an introduction and notes by R. A. Vandegrift; the Diary of Dr. Thomas Flint, California to Maine and Return, 1851–1855, with an introduction by Professor Waldemar Westergaard; and a chapter from Professor Rockwell D. Hunt's forthcoming *History of California: American Period,* entitled a Prize and a National Policy: the Contest for California.

Señor Victoriano Salado Alvarez, on reception into the Academia Mejicana, read a discourse of much interest, now printed under the title *Méjico Peregrino: Mejicanismos supervivientes en el Inglés de Norte America* (Mexico, Museo Nacional, pp. 173), in which he has traced the history of many Spanish and Mexican terms in their use, often with change of meaning, in the speech of our southwestern states.

The *Report* of the Historical Commission of the Territory of Hawaii for the two years ending December 31, 1924, shows commendable progress in executing the provisions of the acts relating to the commission, viz., in the duty of preparing and publishing a school text-book of Hawaiian his-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory, a larger history for general reading and reference, and a history of Hawaii's part in the Great War; and the work of marking, preserving, and restoring places and objects of historical interest. There are two documentary appendixes: one containing extracts from the correspondence of David L. Gregg, United States commissioner to Hawaii, Hawaiian minister of finance, and practising attorney in the islands; the other a selection of documents from the Public Record Office illustrating the policy of Great Britain towards the Hawaiian Islands, 1824–1854.

CANADA

In order to further the study of Canadian history, and especially to maintain interest in it among the descendants of those Frenchmen and Englishmen who contributed signally to the upbuilding of Canada, and to ensure the preservation of historical papers which have come down from them, there have been founded by the efforts of Sir Campbell Stuart and Dr. Arthur G. Doughty the Canadian History Society in England, of which the president is the Duke of Connaught and the vice-president the Dowager Countess of Minto, and in France the Société d'Histoire du Canada, with the Duke de Lévis-Mirepoix and the Marquis de Montcalm as presidents. The secretaries are, in London, Mr. H. P. Biggar, and in Paris, M. Théodore Beauchesne.

The *Life of William Dummer Powell, First Judge at Detroit and Fifth Chief Justice of Upper Canada,* by Hon. William R. Riddell, justice of the supreme court of Ontario, has been published by the Michigan Historical Commission (pp. 295).

In the *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Canada, third ser., vol. XVIII., the reader will find an informing survey of the *Early Literature of the Northwest Coast,* in the form of a presidential address of Judge F. W. Howay of British Columbia.

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

A recently published *Diccionario Histórico Popular Hispano-Americano* (Madrid, sucesores de Hernando, pp. xii, 580), by Señor Alfonso Retortillo y Tornos, furnishes compact but useful accounts of places, institutions, and men.

No. 12 of the *Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano* (pp. 198), entitled *La Concesión Leese,* relates to the extensive concession made by the Juárez government in 1864 to Jacob P. Leese of Monterey, Calif., and his associates, for the development of Lower California. About one-half of the volume is occupied with the relevant documents, the other half with a study by Don Fernando Iglesias Calderón, explaining the matter, and defending at all points the Juárez government.

In tomo V. of the *Anales* of the Cuban Academy of History (Havana, 1923) are included tomo III. (1836–1838) of the "Centón Epistolario"

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Domingo del Monte and a paper presented by Carlos M. Trelles y Govín upon his election to the Academy entitled El Sitio de la Habana y la Dominación Británica en Cuba. With the latter are appendixes containing extracts from a contemporary diary (that of Capitán D. Juan de Castas, in the New York Public Library) and a bibliography.

Tomo III. of the *Biblioteca Argentina de Libros Raros Americanos,* the interesting series put forth by the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters at Buenos Aires, is a facsimile (photographic) reproduction of the nine *Tratados* published by Fray Bartolomé de Las Casas in Seville in 1552 and 1553, beginning with the famous *Brevissima Relación de la Destruyción de las Indias*—in a stout volume of 648 pages, with an index. Later, a monograph on Las Casas and his *Tratados,* by Dr. Jorge Cabral Texo, professor of the history of Argentine law at La Plata, is expected to be published.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. S. Aiton, *The First American Mining Code* (Michigan Law Review, December); A. P. Usher, *The Influence of American Business on National Life* (Harvard Business Review, April, 1924); H. de Peyster, *Les Origines Françaises et Flamandes de New-York* (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, March–April); R. P. Bieber, *The British Plantation Councils of 1670–1674* (English Historical Review, January); *Crèvecœur on the Susquehanna, 1774–1776* [excerpts from an unpublished manuscript] (Yale Review, April); Charles Moore, *The Stepfatherhood of George Washington,* II. (Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, March); J. C. Fitzpatrick, *When Mrs. Washington went to Camp* (*ibid.*); R. Castex, *L'Armateur de La Fayette: Pierre de Basmarein* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); G. S. Eddy, *Les Constitutions des 13 États-Unis de l'Amérique* (Ex Libris, December); G. N. Tricoche, *La Prise de Nassau* (*Bahamas*) *par les Royalistes de la Caroline du Sud en 1783* (Revue des Études Historiques, July–September); D. H. Bacot, *Constitutional Progress and the Struggle for Democracy in South Carolina following the Revolution* (South Atlantic Quarterly, January); Maj.-Gen. W. H. Carter, *Early History of American Cavalry* (Cavalry Journal, January); E. M. Coulter, *Early Frontier Democracy in the First Kentucky Constitution* (Political Science Quarterly, December); Capt. R. S. Carswell, *Old Military Records* [letters of Gen. James Wilkinson, 1796–1797; extracts from orderly book of Lewis and Clark, etc.] (Infantry Journal, January); Maj. E. N. McClellan, U. S. M. C., *First Commander of the Marine Corps: William Ward Burrows* (Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, March); T. R. Hay, *Jefferson Davis Once More* (*ibid.*); Capt. H. E. Fuller, *The Land Battle of Manila* (Infantry Journal, February); Grant Foreman, *The Red River and the Spanish Boundary in the United States Supreme Court* (Chronicles of Oklahoma, September); P. de Vassière, *Le Saint de l'Acadie: Charles de Menou d'Aulnay, 1649* (Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Fran-

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

çaises, 1924, 4); Cl. Bonnault de Mézy, *Les Canadiens en France et aux Colonies après la Cession, 1760–1815* (*ibid.*); C. V. Mey, *El Derecho Obrero en la Colonización Española* (Humanidades, VIII.); C. Garcia Prada, *The Historical Personality of the Republic of Colombia* (Inter-America, February); J. Q. Dealey, *National Policies toward Latin America* (Coast Artillery Journal, January).

PRODUCED 2004 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED